

MAN

NOT IMMORTAL,

THE ONLY SHIELD

AGAINST THE SEDUCTIONS

OF

MODERN SPIRITUALISM.

BY D. P. HALL.

ISHED AT THE ADVENT REVIEW OFFICE.
ROCHESTER, N. Y.

1855.

HERITAGE ROOM
James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
Berrien Springs, MI 49104

Vault

BT

921

.H3

HER.

MAN

NOT IMMORTAL:

THE ONLY SHIELD

AGAINST THE SEDUCTIONS

OF

MODERN SPIRITUALISM.

BY D. P. HALL.

PUBLISHED AT THE ADVENT REVIEW OFFICE.
ROCHESTER, N. Y.
1854.

HERITAGE ROOM
James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
Berrien Springs, MI 49104

WOLFE

PHOTOGRAPHED BY

WOLFE

Vault
BT
921
H3
HER.

392437

9605571

WOLFE

WOLFE

...have said let us select a modern ...
the manner of interpreting their testimony ...
language of these witnesses to be ...
most obvious and ...
we ask: Have we any more authority for giving
their language a ...
than we have the language of any living speaker
or writer of the present time? If you have the
right to the same right to interpret you must have
I not the same right to interpret you must have
interested in this way certainly in this way

MAN NOT IMMORTAL.

Do the Scriptures represent any part of man as being immortal? The truthful solution of this question is certainly deemed important by every faithful student of the Bible, not simply as an abstract theme, but on account of its relative bearings upon every other doctrine of that Sacred Book. The views we entertain of man's nature will give shape and color, to a very great extent, to our views of life, death, resurrection, heaven, hell, and, in fact, all the other subjects of revelation. Hence the importance of searching for truth touching this fundamental point. The only question which the conscientious believer in the truths of the Bible deems it at all important to ask, is, What saith the Scriptures? He is perfectly willing to submit the question to Moses, Isaiah, Christ or Paul, or any, and all others who have spoken as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; and having ascertained their decision, await patiently the issues of that day when all things shall be made manifest.

But before inquiring what these faithful and true

23X-42

witnesses have said, let us reflect a moment upon the manner of interpreting their testimony. Is the language of these witnesses to be understood in its most obvious and literal sense? And why not? we ask. Have we any more authority for giving their language a secret or mystical interpretation, than we have the language of any living speaker, or writer, of the present time? If you have the right to interpret Moses or Jesus, mystically, have I not the same right to interpret you after the same fashion? If one writer, or speaker, may be interpreted in this way, certainly all others may; and where will this mysticism end? Only where imagination and fancy terminate. Different individuals, equally honest and intelligent, may faithfully investigate the scriptural bearings of any question, and differ widely in their conclusion. Now I know of but one reasonable solution of this difficult question; viz., they are governed by different rules of interpretation, and must of necessity, if faithful to their own rules, differ in the result of their researches.

I never realized the importance of being governed by correct principles of interpretation more fully than at the present time, just having had an interview with a minister of one of the popular denominations, who denied the literality and tangibility of every thing taught in the Bible. The second coming of Christ, death, resurrection, and in fact every thing taught as the foundation of faith and hope, are by this mysticism swept away, and the past present and future all thrown into chaos, and left without form and void. But there is a remedy for all this jargon and confusion, and

it is to be found in the use of the literal principles of interpretation. Interpret the language of the sacred writers as you do the language of all others, and this difficulty would be speedily obviated. We submit the following rules as being absolutely necessary in the study of the Holy Scriptures, in order to arrive at truth on this, or any other subject.

1. Give the language of the inspired writers, its plain, obvious and literal import.

2. Bring all classes of figures to harmonize with the literal.

3. Study the Bible by subjects, tracing them through the entire book, and having ascertained the harmonious teachings of all the inspired writers upon any one subject, you must have the truth upon that subject.

These plain and simple rules are easily complied with, and must, we think, commend themselves to every man's conscience. We purpose following them faithfully in the investigation of the subject before us.

After having made these few prefatory remarks we are prepared to enter directly upon the question proposed.

Do the Scriptures teach that any part of man is immortal? Webster defines immortal to mean, "Having no principle of alteration or corruption; exempt from death; having life or being that shall never end." The inquiry then is this, Is any part of the creature called man exempt from death? Popular theology and philosophy would answer this question most unhesitatingly in the affirmative. But do the Scriptures so teach?

The current theology, and that which we shall

call in question in this inquiry, runs thus: Man is a compound of mortality and immortality. His body is composed of matter, and is, therefore, mortal. His soul, or spirit, is a separate spiritual entity, dwelling in the body, conscious, immortal, intelligent and responsible. The practical workings of this fundamental proposition in popular theology, together with the views of death, resurrection, judgment, &c., growing out of it, we will leave until another time and place in the investigation.

It will be seen very readily by any one, that this view of the subject makes the soul or spirit of man really the man proper. His consciousness, intelligence, responsibility, immortality, and all that is really noble and dignified, pertains to the soul. Now this, if true, makes the soul of man the all-important part; and we find it is so considered by all those who embrace this view of man's nature. In proof of this point, call to mind their sermons, exhortations, prayers, hymns, obituaries, and especially funeral occasions. Every thing is done for, and to, the immortal soul, or deathless spirit. The body, when mentioned at all, is noticed merely as an unimportant appendage.

I would just at this point call especial attention to the infinite importance which those who believe in the immortal-soul entity attach to it. They believe it to contain all the life, to be the part of man in which all mental and moral faculties inhere, to be the only part capable of vice or virtue, and capable of rewards independent of, and separate from, the body; and it is by them, in fact, constituted the grand basis of future life. Take away our immortal soul, say they, and you remove

every thing from us worth living for: you destroy the foundation of Christianity, and cut off all our hopes of the future. You clothe the heavens in sackcloth, and cause the dark pall of death to settle down upon the bright and hopeful future. Now if all this be true, if man be really such a mysterious compound, if his soul, or spirit, be what popular philosophers and theologians denominate it, we shall most certainly expect to find revelation correspondingly prolific upon this point. That which is infinitely most important and noble in man's nature and composition, will undoubtedly share most largely of divine regard. We shall expect to find the origin, attributes and destiny of this soul most clearly and explicitly defined. And should we fail, in searching the divine record of man's creation, to find one single syllable devoted to this soul entity, would it not cause the believer in the immortal-soul theology to marvel? I should certainly think any honest and conscientious believer in the perfection and sufficiency of the sacred writings, would be completely stunned at the onset, to find no record whatever of the origin, or attributes of such a soul. Let me invite such an one to go with me to the opening page of revelation, and there analyze critically what the Eternal Spirit has said concerning the origin, and nature of the creature man.

Gen. i, 26. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." Here God announces

his intention to make a creature called man, and to subject all other living creatures connected with this earth to his dominion. No intimation is here given as to what the materials of his composition are to be. Gen. ii, 7, furnishes us with the desired information: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Here then we have the simple, full, and complete record of man's creation, the material from which he was made, and the process of making him alive is all set plainly before us. We have now no lack of information.

It will be readily seen by the most superficial observer, that all which is here said relates to a being made of the dust of the ground. Man's creation is here clearly set forth, and the material entering into his composition. Now let me ask, Out of what was man made? Was it part material, and part immaterial? part mortal, and part immortal? part of the dust, and part spiritual essence? Ans. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." Not the most distant hint is here given of such a double entity, such a double nature, or a double process of any kind. All is simple, and easily understood; and instead of clearly defining the immortal soul, it shuts it out completely and forever from the book of God. From this point, forward to the last "amen" in the Apocalypse, man is treated as a unit being, composed of dust, and made alive by the power of God. His life and character, death, resurrection, mortality, immortality, and future destiny, stand related to man made wholly of dust.

But if an advocate of the immortal-soul theology be pressed here at this point for something like a show of evidence for his theory, he will divide the record something like this: God made the *body* of man out of the dust, and afterward put the *living soul* into it. If the record read in this way it would afford some proof of the separate entity of the soul, we confess; but it would in that event fall infinitely short of proving its immortality, or any of the other attributes, or qualities commonly attached to it. A *living soul*, and an *ever-living soul* are quite two things; but all this is wanting in the record. This is begging the whole question. It was the *man* made of *dust*, which was constituted the *living soul*, not the body of man made of dust, and then a living soul made of some spiritual essence, put into it. To show the contrast more fully, notice the Bible record and popular teachings as presented in juxtaposition below.

BIBLE RECORD.

"And the Lord God formed man of the *dust* of the *ground* and breathed into his nostrils the *breath of life*: and *man* became a *living soul*."

POPULAR THEOLOGY.

And the Lord God formed the *body of man* of the *dust* of the *ground*, and put into it the *living soul*.

But if it still be insisted that the phrase, "living soul," in its application to man, furnishes an argument for the separate entity and immortality of the soul, let those who make use of it, be willing to meet any legitimate conclusion drawn from this premise. And the first request we have to make is that they place along with their own immortal-soul entities, the immortal soul of every beast,

bird, insect and reptile that crawls; for this, from the premise they themselves lay down, is certainly legitimate. In the record of creation the Eternal Spirit has made no distinction whatever. In proof of this, we will note several instances where the phrase *living soul* is indiscriminately used with reference to everything that lives by breathing, man being included.

Gen. i, 21. "And God created great whales, and every (*nephesh chayiah*,) *living creature* that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good." Verse 24, "And God said let the earth bring forth the (*nephesh chayiah*,) *living creature* after his kind, cattle, and creeping things and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so." Gen. ii, 7, "And the Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a (*nephesh chayiah*,) *living soul*."

It is admitted by all Hebrew scholars as far as I have been able to learn, that in the original Hebrew, the phrase, *nephesh chayiah*, is used in the instances cited above; so that there is no discrimination made. All, according to the Hebrew, are *nephesh chayiah*, whether of beasts, birds, fishes, insects, reptiles, or men—*living creatures*, or *living soul*—can with equal propriety be applied to one and all. If *living creature* is a proper translation in the first two instances cited, it is in the third also. No good reason can be given for want of uniformity in translating the same phrase, in its application to man's *living soul*, and in its

application to all other breathing frames, *living creatures*. Note other instances, Gen. ii, 19; vi, 19; ix, 10; also Rev. xvi, 3: "And every *living soul* died in the sea." Here then is proof sufficient to give immortal-soul entities to all things breathing the breath of life. Are the immortal-soul theologians willing to append this new and important item to their creed?

But this is not all. There is another important distinction made, say they, in the record. It is affirmed of man that he had the breath of life communicated to him by God, not so of the beast. Here then is another argument for our immortal souls. But let this be tested also, and see if it is not all fancy. No one will question the fact, that God was alike the Creator of all. By consulting Gen. vii, 21, 22, it will be seen that *all have alike the breath of life*. "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: all in whose nostrils was the *breath of life*, of all that was in the dry land, died. See also Gen. vi, 17, to the same intent. After having investigated these two phrases, viz., *living soul* and *breath of life*, in their various applications, who cannot see that if they prove any thing for man, touching his immortality, they prove just as much for the beast!

There is yet another hook upon which popular theology would fain try to hang its immortal soul, and that is the fact that man was created in the image of God. It is asserted that man's being made in the image of God is proof that man resembles God in his *nature*. But the body of man

is mortal and corruptible. God is immortal and incorruptible. So that this likeness cannot be affirmed of man's body. It must, therefore, say they, be a likeness of the soul or spirit. The soul of man, then, from this circumstance, is declared to be immortal.

Let us state the premise and conclusion, something in the form it suggests itself to our mind. The major premise is proved from 1 Tim. vi, 15, 16: "Which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who *only hath immortality.*" The minor premise, is proved from Gen. ii, 27: man is made in the *image of God*—conclusion—man has an immortal soul. We must confess that this looks like spurious logic. The conclusion in this syllogism is positively denied in the major premise, and not once named in the minor. This may look barbarous; but it is just such as theologians use in sustaining the immortal soul, from the declaration that man was made in the image of God.

But we cannot see that the conclusion necessarily follows, even if we admit that the likeness man sustains to God consists in a similarity in nature and essence. God is omnipotent and omniscient as well as immortal. Why not affirm the image to consist of one of these? It can be done with the same propriety. This kind of logic, if carried out, would not only make man immortal, omnipotent and omnipresent, but would clothe poor, puny man, a worm of earth, with all the glorious perfections of Deity.

The truth is, that man's likeness to God is of the simplest nature. We would submit an expo-

sition of this text which we believe to be free from all these extravagances. Man is made in the *image of God*. The simplest definition of image is *form*. Man may resemble God in this respect, without arrogating to himself any part of the nature, essence, or the attributes of the great I AM. This exposition we believe to be both logical and scriptural. We will not assume it all, however, as our opponents do, but proceed to prove, first, that God has a *form*, and in the second place that this is the divine definition of image.

Phil. ii, 5, 6. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the *form of God* thought it not robbery to be equal with God." This is declared of Jesus. Now see Heb. i, 3. "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express *image of his person.*" Here then, the matter is made perfectly plain from the word of God. Christ is in the personal image of God, and *this* is being in his *form*.

But before leaving this point, so often alluded to by those who believe in the immortal soul entity, we would invite attention to the fact that the immortal soul is not said to be in the *image*, but the *man*. Now see the record. God made *man* of the *dust*. That, then, which was made of *dust*, is in the image of God. See Gen. ix, 6. "Who-so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the *image of God* made he *man*." Here, then, man possessing blood, is in the image of God. Numerous other instances of like import might be adduced in proof that man's likeness to God did not consist in a similarity of *natures*, but, simply, in *form*.

We have now investigated the record of man's creation, and noticed the only points which can possibly be urged in proof of the doctrine that man is in possession of a *soul*, which is a *separate* entity from his body, endowed with consciousness, intelligence, responsibility and immortality. For be it remembered that those advocating the immortality of the soul, have two very important points to prove: first, that the soul or spirit of man is a *separate entity* from his body, and, second, that it is immortal. The proof which might sustain the first point, would fall infinitely short of proving the second. It is one thing to prove the existence of an entity, and quite another task to prove what its qualities or attributes are. This discrimination and order in the controversy, is not often noticed by those investigating the subject. And after carefully investigating, we cannot find in the phrases, *living soul*, *breath of life*, or *image of God*, any proof of either position. There is not in one or all these phrases, the slightest evidence that the soul or spirit is a separate entity from the body: letting alone their proving its immortality.

THE DEATH THREATENED ADAM.

We will now notice the relation Adam sustained to the *Law of God*, the *Tree of Life*, and the *explanation of the Penalty* threatened in consequence of disobedience. First then the law or prohibition. See Gen. ii, 17. But of the tree of the knowledge of *good and evil*, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof

thou shalt surely die. Here then Adam is presented with a rule by which his obedience or disobedience can be tested: here he can decide his character and destiny; disobedience to this simple test, will make him a sinner, and bring him under the threatened *penalty*: *Thou shalt surely die.* The record shows the result.

But what was Adam's condition previous to transgression? He had newly come from the hand of his Creator, physically, intellectually and morally good. Very good was pronounced upon *man*, in connection with every thing else which God created and made. But what was his character and nature? Was he holy or unholy, mortal or immortal, or in a state of susceptibility? Moral character, is not the subject of creation: it is the result of action towards law, or a rule of some kind, having previous knowledge of the existence of such law, or rule. The first recorded action towards the prohibition in the garden, was that of disobedience; hence his first positive character was that of a sinner. Adam and Eve could not plead want of previous knowledge. See Gen. iii, 3. But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, *lest ye die.* This was the language of Eve in reply to the Serpent, and shows a perfect understanding on her part. Gen. ii, 16, 17, shows that Adam could not offer an excuse for want of information beforehand. We see, then, that their action formed their moral character. How was it with reference to mortality or immortality? were they immortal? We answer most unhesitatingly, No! That which is immortal can-

not *die*. If Adam was immortal, of what possible use could the tree of life be? would God undertake to prevent from death that which could not *die*? To prevent immortality from dying, belongs in the same category with the *death* that never *dies*: they are both absolute contradictions. But was Adam mortal? No: if mortal, he must die, as a necessary consequence; and death in that event, could not be the penalty; but it was the penalty, therefore Adam was not mortal. He was then placed on trial for immortality, as the result of obedience; but disobedience brought mortality, and consequent death.

We now invite especial attention to the phrase, *Thou shalt surely die*! What kind of death did God threaten Adam, in case of disobedience? Popular theologians answer very glibly, *Death spiritual, death temporal, and death eternal*; which is, when more fully explained, a *state of sin, separation of soul and body, and eternal misery*. Here then we have *three deaths* instead of *one* which God threatened. I do not marvel, in looking over this item in popular theology, that Adam, in the view of such persons, was considered a giant in intellect; for such he must have been; and not only so, but it must have been awfully perverted, if he interpreted the *one* death to be *three*, and then understood the second one to be *more* life, and the third one to be *life eternal*.

What did Adam understand the threatened death to mean? Death is a negative condition, and the opposite of life. Now how many lives had Adam? he could not be threatened with more or different deaths, than he had lives: how many

lives had he? One, simply one. He had no *moral* or *spiritual* life. This he would have had, had he been obedient; but he was not; therefore he had no such life. He could not be threatened with eternal death, unless he had eternal life: this he had not. What then must the death have been? Simply the unbuilding of the man, the returning of the newly made man to the elements from which he was created, the deprivation of conscious existence. To urge more than this is unreasonable and unwarrantable from the language. The idea that *eternal misery* was threatened, makes God a cruel tyrant! Think of it! For this one sin of Adam, he and the countless millions springing from him, are doomed to hopeless misery throughout the untold cycles of eternity. Remember this death passed from Adam to all his posterity; and for it there is no remedy: God did not say to Adam, *You shall surely die, unless you repent*; but unequivocally, *Thou shalt surely die*.

This idea, then, cannot be harbored for one moment. Let us look at *spiritual death*. What is this but being a sinner, or being in a state of sin? This, then, was the *crime*, not the *penalty*; this was the *guilt*, not the *punishment*: this confounds cause and effect—sin and its penalty—and would represent the Judge of all the earth, in the execution of it, as saying, Adam, you have sinned; now as the penalty for this act of disobedience, I pronounce you a sinner. How ridiculous this would look in a human judge: infinitely more so in the Divine. There is but one rational and consistent conclusion left, and that has already been expressed: the returning of the conscious, intelligent, and

responsible Adam, to the dust of the ground. I know of but one plausible objection which can be urged against literal death's being intended; and that is, the phrase, "In the day that thou eatest thereof."

It is urged with some little show of plausibility that Adam was to die the death threatened, within twenty-four hours from the time of transgressing. He did not die literally, until nine hundred and thirty years; consequently the death was not literal, but spiritual. All this turns upon the idea that God threatened the completion of this penalty in one day of twenty-four hours. Look at the margin of your Bible, and you will see, Heb. *dying thou shalt die*. This view of the subject is sustained by all the Hebrew criticisms, which I have had the opportunity of examining. *Moth tamuth*, "*dying thou shalt die*," is a literal translation, and denotes a process, commenced on that very day. Two conditions are clearly set forth in the threatened penalty, "*dying thou shalt die*:" a state of mortality, ending in death. This view is fully sustained by God in his own explanation of this penalty.

After Adam sinned, and confessed his guilt, God proceeded to explain and pronounce the penalty; and it seems to me that all doubts, if any yet exist, can be most satisfactorily removed at this point; for certainly, if death spiritual, temporal and eternal was intended, God will bring it all out, explain it, and enforce it. This we should expect, even at the hands of a just and wise judge, of finite capacities; much more from the Infinite judge of all the earth, who will do right. Gen.

iii, 17. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee saying, Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake: in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life: thorns, also, and thistles shall it bring forth to thee: and thou shalt eat the herb of the field: in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, *till thou return unto the ground*; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.

Here God's explanation ends; and we follow the matter on, and notice the arrangements immediately entered into, in order to bring about the execution of the threatened penalty. Read what follows. Gen. iii, 22, 23, 24. And the Lord God said, Behold, the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and LIVE FOREVER; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.

In the scriptures quoted above, we wish to note several important points: First, the tree of life was the means provided by God for conferring immortality and eternal life, upon Adam if he should prove obedient. Second, Adam did not eat of this tree before he sinned. This is evident from what is said: "And now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life." Also is an ad-

verb, and signifies likewise, or in like manner, showing that he had eaten of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; and now lest he after the same manner take of the tree of life, he is driven out. Adam then did not eat of the tree of life before he sinned; so that before he sinned he was not immortal. He did not eat of the tree of life after he sinned; for God guarded the tree, and drove Adam from its vicinity. Here then God has shown his intention towards sinners. Note this particularly: He will allow no sinner to become immortal and live forever. If they are in danger of bringing this fearful calamity upon themselves, God himself will interpose to prevent it, as in the case of Adam. Note again: "And now lest he put forth his hand and eat and live forever," God drives him out, and guards the tree.

Here then we see the real condition of Adam: a mortal, dying creature, toiling and sweating out his existence, and doomed to return to the dust from whence he was taken. In this condition he begat his first son. He could confer no better condition or nature upon his posterity than he had himself; hence this is the condition of all the sons of Adam, this day, unless God has worked a miracle in their deliverance. Enoch and Elijah, and all the faithful who are alive at the second appearing of Christ, will prove exceptions to this general rule. The tree of life in old Eden, having been removed from the reach of Adam and his posterity, they must look for it in Eden restored, and through the second Adam.

"The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." (A

life-giving spirit.) We must now look for immortality and eternal life through Jesus, and the resurrection from the dead, or a change equivalent thereto. No immortality as yet for Adam and his posterity, in their creation, or relation to the tree of life.

Adam in nine hundred and thirty years, experienced most fully the truth of the declaration of Jehovah, *Thou shalt surely die*; dust, *thou*, Adam, the first living soul, art, and unto dust shalt *thou*, Adam, the first living soul, return. Life and death, then, as they stand connected with Adam, or any of his posterity, point out two conditions, one exactly the opposite of the other. Life—conscious existence; that state of an organized being in which all its functions are performed; vitality. Death—that state of an organized being in which there is a total and permanent cessation of all the vital functions; when the organs have not only ceased to act, but have lost the susceptibility of renewed action; unconsciousness. These simple, literal and obvious definitions, are not only true with reference to the first life and death, but all subsequent ones, unless the context or nature of the subject forbids it. A figurative life, or death, is never admissible, unless there is a clear necessity. If the death threatened Adam be moral, or spiritual, it will certainly involve popular theology in a sad dilemma. "For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." If the death threatened Adam be spiritual death, then the life Christ promises is spiritual life; then all become sinners through Adam, and saints through Christ—no exceptions, universal salvation follows. Popular theologians

thus unwittingly place arguments in the hands of their opponents. And not only so, but Christ, in order to redeem man from death, must himself die: if Adam and his posterity die a spiritual death, then Christ must die this death to redeem them. Spiritual death is being under the dominion of sin, or being a sinner; Christ, then, must have become a sinner, in order to redeem man. This contradicts the scripture: he was without sin.

If eternal misery was a part of the death threatened Adam, then it would read, As in Adam all are made eternally miserable, so in Christ all are to be made eternally happy. If the death was eternal misery, then Christ must have suffered eternal misery in order to redeem man; but where will the death end, and the life commence, in this view of the subject, if the death be eternal misery. The life will be forever excluded, unless eternal misery have an end; for it is evident that the life promised, must take hold of man where the death threatened ends. If the death be eternal misery then the life promised must commence at the end of eternity. What absurdities!! Literal death shuts out all these inconsistencies, and renders all plain and harmonious. Adam died a literal death: his posterity die the same literal death on account of his sin: having inherited his mortal, dying nature. Christ dies a literal death to redeem man. As in Adam *all* die a literal death, so in Christ shall all have a literal resurrection to a literal life.

But there is a second death threatened those who are disobedient. Now if the first death be spiritual, then they must have a spiritual resurrection, and die another spiritual death. This, more

fully explained, would mean, first, all are to become sinners; second, all are to become saints; third, part are to become sinners again. This conclusion, which is legitimate according to spiritual death, is plainly contradicted by Rev. xx, 6: "On such the second death hath no power;" so that those who are once converted can never backslide. Time would fail to narrate all the incongruous positions of spiritualism. We will close upon this point by calling especial attention to the fact, that, the phrase, *thou shalt surely die*, upon which spiritualism has spent so much of its mysticism, is, throughout the entire Bible, in every instance, a literal death. See Gen. xx, 7; Num. xxvi, 65; Judges xii, 22; 1 Sam. xiv, 39, 44; xx, 31; xxii, 16; 2 Sam. xii, 5; 2 Kings i, 4, 16; viii, 10; Jer. xxvi, 8; Eze. iii, 18; xxxiii, 8, &c. All these instances, and every other one which occurs, are clearly literal death. Why then should the case in Genesis be explained out of all harmony with all the other instances? Certainly no good reason can be assigned.

MAN'S CONDITION IN DEATH.

Does the Bible anywhere represent *death* as being the event by which man passes into a higher state of *life*? a state of *consciousness*? the gate to endless joy, or endless woe? Do men pass to paradise or perdition, heaven or hell, by or through the event called death? These are all plain questions, and easily answered from the plain word of the Lord.

But allow me to say that at this particular point

in the inquiry, we are very liable to have our reason and judgment too much under the influence of prejudice and sympathy, having been trained up from infancy in the belief of going immediately from this state of existence to another; and having a natural dread of *death*, we are apt to believe upon very slight evidence all that popular theology teaches upon this point.

It is an old adage that,

"A man convinced against his will,
Is of the same opinion still."

and it is true evidently that it is a very hard matter to convince a person of the truth of any doctrine, which comes in contact with his early training, and all his established modes of thought; and it is equally true, that it is an easy matter indeed to convince a man of the truth of any thing when all these circumstances are favorable. But in order to carry on an investigation with profit, and to come to truthful conclusions, the mind must be entirely stripped of all such foreign influences, and left perfectly balanced. As the tradesman's scales would be very imperfect standards of weight, did one side preponderate, so the mind of man is illy prepared to judge of the real weight or true merit of Bible truth, when it is bent to one side by prejudice, early training, or undue sympathy.

The questions propounded above are important, in more than one point of view, but especially so with reference to the Bible teachings concerning the Second Coming of Christ, the Resurrection of the dead, and the Judgment. If these questions be answered in the affirmative (as they all are by popular theology) these three *fundamental* doc-

trines of holy writ are of no possible importance. If answered in the negative (as I shall attempt to answer them) they are of infinite importance.

In order to enable us to see the contrast more strikingly between popular theology and the Bible upon the point now under consideration, viz., death, I will place the two views in juxtaposition. First, then, how is death spoken of in the Bible? What did the ancient worthies expect by such an event? Where did they expect to go when they died? See the record.

BIBLE.

Gen. v. 3. "And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and he died."

Verse 11. "And all the days of Enos were nine hundred and five years; and he died."

Verse 17. "And all the days of Mahalaleel were eight hundred ninety and five years; and he died."

Verse 24. "And Enoch walked with God, and he was not: for God took him." Mark in this case the contrast between Enoch and the others mentioned. When God takes a person to heaven, to himself, he mentions it, not in the language of "he died," remember, but he did not die, he "took him." Here in this case, and that of Elijah, God has shown us most clearly, his plan of taking men to heav-

POPULAR THEOLOGY.

We will quote the language of Wilber Fisk, not however for the purpose of arraying him against the Bible, but to show the sentiments which popular theology teaches upon this subject.

Turning to his wife he said, "Think not when you see this poor feeble body stretched in death, that this is your husband. Oh no! your husband will have escaped free and liberated from every clog. He will have plumed his glad wings and soared away through the etherial regions to that celestial city of light and love. What! talk of burying your husband? No, never. Your husband cannot be buried. He will be in heaven."

Socrates said, "I shall go to the felicities of the bles-

en. It is not by halves, by killing them and taking their immortal souls, as popular theology teaches, but by translating them, by taking them up bodily.

Gen. xlix, 29. Jacob's charge. "And he charged them and said unto them, I am to be gathered unto my people: bury me with my fathers in the cave that is in the field of Ephron the Hittite. Verse 30. "In the cave that is in the field of Machpelah, which is before Mamre, in the land of Canaan, which Abraham bought with the field of Ephron the Hittite, for a possession of a burying place."

Verse 31. "There they buried Abraham and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac and Rebekah his wife; and there I buried Leah."

Isa. xxxviii, 18, 19. "For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise thee as I do this day; the father to the children shall make known thy truth."

Ps. lxxxviii, 10. "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee?"

sed: you will not bury Socrates. I shall go to the gods."

DR. WATTS.

"Why should we start and fear to die?

What timorous worms we mortals are

Death is the gate of endless joy

And yet we dread to enter there."

Dread to enter endless joy!!

"But oh, the soul that never dies!

At once it leaves the clay! Ye thoughts pursue it where it flies,

And track its wondrous way.

Up to the courts where angels dwell

It mounts, triumphing there;

Or devils plunge it down to hell,

In infinite despair."

Goes to Heaven or Hell at Death!!

"I'll praise my Maker with my breath;

And when my voice is lost in death,

Praise shall employ my nobler powers."

We might carry this contrast of popular sentiment and Bible teaching, to almost any length; but let this suffice for the present upon this point. We invite especial attention however to one point, viz., That in every instance where the death of an individual is mentioned in the sacred writings, be he saint or sinner, (unless it be in a parable) it is simply said "he died," and was "buried." Now if popular theology be true upon this point, how can this wonderful suppression of truth be accounted for? It certainly cannot without leaving guilt, deception and falsehood upon the pages of the sacred record; and are we driven to this fearful alternative? No: let God be true, though all men are found liars. There is not the slightest similarity, the faintest resemblance, between the current theology touching death, and the Bible account of the same. The one represents it as entering into higher life; the other, total deprivation of life: one, as the gate to endless joy and light; the other, as the gate to the grave and darkness: the one, as a state of conscious delights or shivering pains; the other, a place where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest: the small and the great are there, the servant is free from his master.

We now invite the attention of the reader to a consideration of those scriptures which speak directly to the point; viz., Man's condition in death. Is man, in the interim between death and the resurrection, in a state of consciousness? The first divine definition of death would certainly forbid such an idea. God said to Adam, Thou shalt surely die. Gen. ii, 17. God's own definition of this

phrase is, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. iii, 19. Here we have God's own definition of death; and if it is possible for the Eternal Spirit to frame language completely forbidding the idea of conscious and intelligent existence in death, he has here done it. I should like to see a believer in the immortality of the soul undertake to describe the destruction of the intelligent and conscious man, in the same space, as completely as it is here done. I believe it to be absolutely impossible. God is addressing Adam. Now is Adam merely the body of Adam? Is God speaking to the unconscious clay? the shell in which conscious, intelligent and responsible Adam dwells? Will you contend that God is talking to that which cannot hear or understand, and saying to it, Because you have done so and so you shall die? What a strange procedure! What would you think of a man who should talk in this way to an unconscious stump or stone, accusing it of sin, and denouncing punishment! If this would look unreasonable in man, much more so in God.

Is he talking then to the immortal soul? and saying to it, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return?" Either one of these positions involves nonsense and absurdity. What then can be done? There is yet another view which makes all plain: God made of the dust of the ground a being called man, he gave him life, which constituted him a conscious, intelligent and responsible being. Consciousness, intelligence and responsibil-

ity, then, inhere in the *organized man*, the *living soul*, and not in an immortal soul, put into the dust. Now if man has a conscious, intelligent existence, after the living organism is returned to its simple and original elements, then by the same parity of reasoning, he must have had before his creation or organization. It is the dust made into a man, made alive, conscious and intelligent, by the power and wisdom of God, which is by that same power and wisdom, returned to unconsciousness by depriving it of life, by which the man returns again to dust. We append here David's view of this same subject, as being perfectly plain. Ps. cxlvi, 3, 4. "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth: in that very day his *thoughts perish*." Now I ask in the light of this inspired definition, how any one can misunderstand?

The process of creation, death and resurrection, is all made plain in the Bible, and is the building, unbuilding and building again of man: explained in Gen. to be, first, the organizing of dust, and putting into it the breath of life: consciousness, and intelligence is the result or effect. Second, his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish; or, as given by Solomon, [Eccl. xii, 7,] "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit, [breath of life,] shall return unto God who gave it." Now for the third item; i. e., the Resurrection. See Eze. xxxvii. Read to verse 15. Note first the bones brought together; next, sinews laid upon them; then flesh; and all covered with skin; but

no spirit put in yet. Compare verses 5, 6, 8, 9, with 14; and putting spirit into the man re-organized or resurrected, is explained: "Behold, I will cause *breath* to enter into you, and ye shall *live*." Here, then, all is made plain.

See Job iii, 11. He asks this question: Why died I not from the womb? and in verses 13-20, his condition in case he had died is described: "For now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have slept, then had I been at rest. With kings and counsellors of the earth, which built desolate places for themselves; or with princes that had gold, who filled their houses with silver: or as an hidden untimely birth, I *had not been*; as infants which never *saw light*. There the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary be at rest. There the prisoners rest together; they hear not the voice of the oppressor. The small and the great are there; and the servant is free from his master." Who can read this description given by the patriarch Job, and not see that death consigns all ranks and characters to the same place; and this place is not the Orthodox Heaven or Hell, but quite another locality.

Job vii, 21. "And why dost thou not pardon my transgression, and take away mine iniquity? for now shall I sleep in the dust; and thou shalt seek me in the morning, but *I shall not be*." Can this language be true if Job is this day a conscious being, either in soul or body? It certainly cannot. See Job x, 21, 22, 23. Job here asks this question: "Are not my days few?" He then replies, "Cease then and let me alone, that I may take comfort a little, before I go whence I shall not re-

turn, even to the land of darkness, and the shadow of death; a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." As Job was a righteous man, he did not expect to go to hell; so this must be descriptive of heaven, if Job went there at death. Heaven, then, is a dark, disorderly place! Will this suit modern Orthodoxy? I trow not.

Job xiv, 1. "Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not." Is this descriptive of an immortal nature which is to continue as long as God continues? Verse 7. Here Job presents a beautiful analogy, and also a fair and plain contrast: "For there is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease. Though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground; yet through the scent of water it will bud, and bring forth boughs like a plant." Note now the contrast: "But man dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; so man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. O that thou wouldest hide me in the grave, that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a set time and remember me." Then comes in the all-important question to dying men, verse 14: "If a man die, [shall his immortal soul go to glory? no I mis-

take] shall he *live again*? all the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. Thou shalt call, and I will answer: thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands." This venerable patriarch says, "all the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come." Where is he to *wait*? in heaven? No: in hell? No: in his present dying mortal state, waiting for death? No: he is talking of death. If a man *die* shall he live again? See Chap. xvii, 13-16, and the question is fully and satisfactorily answered: "If I wait the *grave* is mine *house*: I have made my bed in the darkness. I have said to corruption, Thou art my father: to the worm, Thou art my mother, and my sister. And where is now my hope? as for my hope who shall see it? They shall go down to the bars of the pit, when our rest together is in the dust."

Job in all the quotations above, is speaking of *death* and the *grave*, and represents man in the interim between death and resurrection as being asleep in the dust; as waiting in the grave. See this perfect and upright man's hope: Job xix, 23-28. "O that my words were now written! O that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever! for I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." Was a believer in the immortality of the soul, ever known to express himself thus, touching death and the resurrection?

We pass from the testimony of Job to notice that of David. Ps. vi, 45. "Return, O, Lord, deliver my soul: Oh save me for thy mercies' sake; for in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" Ps. xxx, 3, 9. "O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul from the grave: thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit. What profit is there in my blood when I go down to the *pit*? Shall the dust praise thee? shall it declare thy truth?" Compare with Ps. lxxxviii, 10, 11, 12. "Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the *land of forgetfulness*?"

Death, then, sends all its victims into the *land of forgetfulness*. Is this conscious bliss or misery? Ps. cxv, 17. "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into *silence*." Ps. cxlvi, 3-5. "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his *thoughts perish*." Can a man be a conscious and intelligent being without thoughts? Can an immortal, conscious, intelligent soul, exist without thoughts? This declaration from David is a nail in a sure place, and leaves the doctrine of the immortality of the soul no chance to escape; it is fenced in on all sides.

That the Psalmist was not mistaken in his views of death, and the condition of the dead, Peter abundantly testifies in the Acts ii, 29, and onward.

"Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. For David is not ascended into the heavens." Who more likely than David to go, if it was God's plan to take the righteous there at death? We will close with David's testimony by inviting attention to his hope. Ps. xvii, 15. "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I *awake with thy likeness*." Would to God that all who profess righteousness were satisfied with the same expectation.

We pass from David's testimony, to that of Solomon. Solomon, speaking of death, [Eccl. iii, 19,] says: "For that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the *one dieth*, so *dieth the other*." If death, then, be the separation of an immortal soul from a mortal body in the case of man, it is in the case of the beast; "for as the *one dieth*, so *dieth the other*." Eccl. ix, 4, 5, 10. For to him that is joined to all the living, there is hope; for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die; [just here I would ask, What part of man knows? Current theology answers, It is the immortal, conscious soul, that has knowledge. Then *that same shall die*. Is it the unconscious body, or shell, that knows? Then consciousness and knowledge are attributes of the *living dust*, and the immortal soul is entirely useless. Or is it the immortal soul which knows that the mortal body shall die? Yes, that is it, says the advocate for natural immortality, that is the meaning precisely. Yes, this is precisely the way to

prove the immortality of the soul; not from what the Scriptures say, but from what they mean. It is no difficult task for a popular theologian to read his theory out of the Bible, provided you grant him one privilege first; and that is, to read it in. Like the man who was willing to bet that he could squeeze cider out of cotton. This looked like a hard task at first sight; but all was easy; he must put it in first;] but the dead *know not any thing*. [That which was alive, and had *knowledge*, is dead, and knows not any thing.] Neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten." O yes, says the objector, all is plain; this all relates to the body; but the immortal soul with powers enlarged, flies out, to love God supremely in blissful abodes above, or sinks down to hell, there to increase in its hatred of everything good, and to envy only those who are more wicked than itself. But hold! "Also their *love* and their *hatred*, and their *envy*, is now *perished*; neither have they any more a portion forever in *any thing that is done under the sun*." Hence the conclusion he comes to in the tenth verse: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no *work*, nor *device*, nor *knowledge*, nor *wisdom*, in the grave whither thou goest." How very plain. It does seem that God has made this subject so plain that no one can possibly plead a reasonable excuse for misunderstanding. But some object to the testimony of Solomon, supposing him to have been an infidel. This is most plainly contradicted by the closing up of Ecclesiastes. Chap. xii, 13, 14. "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God and keep

his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." In concluding the testimony of David and Solomon, touching the state of the dead, we invite attention to the simple records of their death, and notice the contrast between those and popular obituaries. 1 Kings ii, 10. So David slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David. 1 Kings xi, 43. And Solomon slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David his father.

We pass from this point to notice the testimony of Isaiah concerning Hezekiah king of Judah. It will be seen by reading Chap. xxxviii, that the Prophet notified the king that his house should be set in order, for he must die. The king prayed unto the Lord, and the Lord added unto his days fifteen years. Notice how the king speaks of *death*. Verse 10. "I shall go to the gates of the grave." Verse 17. "Behold for peace, I had great bitterness; but thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption: for thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back." Verse 18. "For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." See Isa. xxv, 8, "He will swallow up death in victory: and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall be taken away from off all the earth; for the Lord hath spoken it." Isa. xxvi, 19. *Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust, for thy dew is as*

the dew of herbs, and the *earth shall cast out the dead.*" No place in Isaiah's view of *death* and *resurrection* for the immortal-soul man that never dies. How unreasonable for the pious king to feel so bad about dying, if death was to send him from the troubles of earth, to the society of the blessed in heaven. "Thy dead men shall live," "Awake, and sing, ye that dwell in the dust," are expressions of sentiment which illy comport with the current phraseology of natural immortality.

Next notice Daniel's testimony. Chap. xii, 2. "And many of them that *sleep in the dust of the earth* shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

Hosea xiii, 14. "I will ransom them from the *power of the grave*; I will ransom them from *death*: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction; repentance shall be hid from mine eyes!"

We leave the Old Testament for the present, and notice the teachings of the New, upon this subject. Do the New-Testament writers speak of death, in common with the prophets, as a state of sleep, of resting in the dust, of waiting in the grave, &c.? as a condition of utter unconsciousness, knowing not any thing, thoughts perishing, love, hatred, envy, and all the attributes of the mind, ceasing, &c.? or do they represent death as being the voice that Jesus sends to call them to his arms; the gate to endless joy or everlasting woe; an event by which the intelligent man leaves the body and flies away through the etherial regions to the celestial city of light and love? Let them testify for themselves.

First, the testimony of Christ. John v, 28.

"Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the *graves* [not in heaven or hell] shall hear his voice [how can the dead body, if it is not susceptible of consciousness or intelligence, hear his voice?] and come forth."

John xi, 14. "Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is *dead*." [Not in heaven or hell.] Verse 43. "And when he thus had spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus come forth; and he that was *dead* came forth." [Not came down from heaven or up from hell and got into his body, but came out of the grave where he had been since his burial.]

Luke vii, 14, 15. "And he came and touched the bier; and they that bare him stood still. And he said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise. And he that was *dead* sat up, and began to speak." What part of this young man, according to current theology, was susceptible of speaking? The immortal soul. Can it die? No. But in this case that part which was *dead*, sat up and spake. Now the supposition that all the intelligence manifested in these instances, all the life and consciousness apparent, resulted from putting the immortal-soul man into an unconscious body is entirely unworthy of candid and serious consideration.

Second, the testimony of Paul. 1 Cor. xv, 18, "Then they also which are *fallen asleep* [not gone to heaven] in Christ." 1 Thess. iv, 13. "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are *asleep*." Verse 14. "Them also which *sleep* in Jesus." Heb. xi, 13. "These all *died* in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off."

John, in Revelation. Chap. xiv, 13. "And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the *dead* which *die* in the Lord from henceforth: yea saith the Spirit, that they may *rest* from their labors; and their works do follow them." Chap. xx, iv. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the *souls* of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, . . . and they *lived*," &c.

Many other testimonies from the New Testament might be adduced, touching the dead, all bearing uniform testimony. They sleep, they rest, they are in the grave, they come forth from the grave, and the like. We will quote one more circumstance, and then close upon this particular thread of the subject. Matt. xxvii, 52. "And the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept, arose and came out of the graves." In all the numerous instances of death, mentioned in the New Testament, there is not the slightest intimation of its being a separation of the immortal and intelligent man, from the unconscious clay or body, by which the man proper, or soul, is sent to heaven, to enjoy bliss, or down to hell to writhe in indescribable anguish;—not, I say, one single instance of this kind. Now if it be true, how can this silence of the sacred writings be accounted for? Can it be possible that a matter of this importance, if true, would be left by infinite wisdom, to four or five doubtful inferences? We leave this branch of evidence to notice another growing out of the resurrection of the dead.

The notion of man's being in possession of an

immortal, conscious and intelligent soul entity, which at death leaves the body and goes to its rewards, either in bliss or misery, is not only forbidden, by what the sacred writings say concerning the dead, but by what is said touching the resurrection of the dead. I am persuaded that any one who will investigate the subject, will not fail to see that the resurrection, as taught in the Scriptures of truth, is a matter of much greater importance than it is held to be, by those who believe in the natural immortality of the soul. As far as my own observation goes, I am satisfied that the resurrection of the dead, is, by a great majority of this class, something to be endured, rather than anxiously desired and longed for. And why, I ask, is this doctrine which is so very important in the Scriptures, so lightly esteemed, and even totally denied, by many of those who believe in the immortality of the soul? The answer is easy: they are furnished with another means of securing all that the resurrection promises; and as a consequence, the resurrection of the dead is counted a matter of no possible importance. I should like to have a thorough believer in this doctrine, undertake to show how the resurrection of the dead body would be of the slightest service to his system of theology. Just in the proportion that the resurrection becomes important, the immortal soul becomes unimportant; and *vice versa*.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

We next invite attention to the resurrection of the dead, as being an event of infinite importance in the view of sacred writers: an event which they

longed and hoped for; which they were willing to sacrifice every thing temporal to obtain: an event to which all the faithful have looked for the realization of their fondest hopes. We will notice it in the first place without making any discrimination or distinction in its order or character.

It was the patriarch Job's only hope. "If a man die shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come. Thou shalt call and I will answer. If I wait, the grave shall be my house. And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." Job xiv, 14, 15; xvii, 13; xix, 26.

It was David's hope. "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness."

It was the great theme of the apostle Paul's preaching, and his hope. "He preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection." "And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked." "Of the hope and resurrection of the dead, I am called in question." "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets: and have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." Acts xvii, 18, 32; xxiii, 6; xxiv, 14, 15. "Except it be for this one voice, that I cried standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day." Verse 21.

It was the time and event pointed out by our

Saviour, when the virtuous were to receive their reward. "Then said he also to him that bade him, When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbors; lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind; and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the *resurrection of the just.*" Luke xiv, 12-14.

A host of worthies suffered the loss of every thing that they might obtain it. "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off." "And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." "Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection. Heb. xi, 13, 35, 39.

It was the apostle Paul's Mark, Prize, The high calling of God in Christ Jesus. "That I may know him, and the power of his *resurrection*, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Phil. iii, 8-14.

It was acknowledged by our Saviour himself that without it, those given him by his Father must be lost. "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at

the last day; and this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day." Notice the infinite importance attached to it by the apostle Paul in

I CORINTHIANS XV.

12. "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?"

13. "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen."

14. "And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain."

15. "Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ; whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not."

16. "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised."

17. "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins."

18. "Then they also which are *fallen asleep* in Christ are *perished.*"

19. "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."

20. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept."

21. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead."

22. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

29. "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?"

30. "And why stand we in jeopardy every hour ?

31. "I protest by your rejoicing which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily."

32. "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if the dead rise not ? let us eat and drink ; for to-morrow we die."

We invite especial attention to several points clearly set forth in Paul's argument in this place, touching the resurrection. He notices several calamities which must necessarily follow the non-resurrection of the dead : a notion which some in the Corinthian church had fallen into.

"For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ *are perished*."

How can it be said of those whose immortal souls had been in glory, in the presence of God where is fullness of joy, and pleasures forevermore, for hundreds of years, that they are perished unless the dead body was to be raised up ? What would the resurrection of the dead, unconscious clay, have to do with the endless felicity, the seraphic joys of the emancipated soul ? It could enjoy bliss and glory, honor and life, quite as well without a resurrection as with it. Was a believer in the immortality of the soul ever heard to put forth such a sentiment as this ? The immortal-soul dogma, instead of leading its advocates to speak after this fashion concerning the resurrection, leads in quite another and contrary direction : even to the total denial of the resurrection of the body altogether ; which is proving to be its legitimate result, its practical tendency.

Note another result in case of non-resurrection : "If after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not ? let us eat and drink ; for to-morrow we die." If the dead rise not, all the Apostle's labors and self denial, and all his sacrifices, would prove of no advantage : the virtuous and vicious would all meet the same fate, provided the dead rise not. Let us eat and drink, let us make the very best of a bad case ; for to-morrow we die, and that is the end of all our hopes and fears. Is this the style of immortal soulism ? is this the way current theology looks upon the resurrection of the dead ? The answer is obvious : it would soon expire under such reasoning as this : the supposed vast and important benefits accruing to man from this source would soon be lost sight of, and swallowed up in the more scriptural hope of a part in the first resurrection. We invite attention again to the use Paul makes of the resurrection, as being entirely incompatible with the idea, of his believing in an intermediate state of happiness.

1 THESSALONIANS IV.

13. "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope."

14. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him."

15. "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain, unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep."

16. "For the Lord himself shall descend from

heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first?"

17. "Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

18. "Wherefore, comfort one another with these words."

The circumstances under which the Apostle gave vent to the strain of sentiment penned above, were those, which would have called forth the doctrine of the soul's immortality, and an intermediate state of bliss for the faithful, if it had been true. The Thessalonian brethren were liable, like all others who have the common sympathies of human nature, to grieve at the loss of their kindred and brethren; and the Apostle would not leave them without comfort under such circumstances. Would an expounder of modern theology under similar circumstances neglect to make known to the circle of sad and tearful mourners, the fact that the immortal soul free from every clog, was now in the enjoyment of bliss and glory at the right hand of God? This would be the very occasion for him to expatiate upon the enlarged capacities, and the perfect happiness of the emancipated spirit; but the Apostle comforted the brethren at Thessalonica with far different words. He concludes this interesting exhortation by saying, "Wherefore, comfort one another with these words." What were those words? Christ will come, and your dead friends shall live again.

We still farther remark upon this circumstance

that, their belief in the resurrection of Jesus, was to be the basis of their hope touching the resurrection of their friends. "If ye believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." Now I would like to know what logical connection there is between the resurrection of Jesus, and the flight of the immortal soul at death? how could the one aid in the belief of the other? It should rather be, If you believe that Jesus died, and his immortal soul, or deathless spirit fled to heaven, even so the immortal spirits of those who die, will God take there with his. This text is sometimes explained after this manner: If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him; that is, when Jesus comes down from heaven God will bring along with him from heaven the immortal souls of those whose bodies are sleeping in Jesus. This difficulty, if it be one, grows out of the expression of God's bringing the sleeping ones with him from some place. What place is this? heaven, or the grave? Ans. "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead, [not from heaven,] our Lord Jesus." Heb. xiii. 20. Also, "Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus." 2 Cor. iv. 14.

The language of the Saviour, in comforting the sorrowing Martha, was similar to Paul's in the case just cited. Jesus saith unto her, "Thy brother shall rise again." [Not thy brother is in heaven.] Martha replied in harmony with this sentiment, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." John xi. 23, 24.

In concluding upon this branch of the subject, let me ask if any man can believe, that Christ, prophets and apostles, would speak of death and resurrection, under every conceivable variety of circumstances, and if it were true, never once intimate the existence and attributes of such a soul or spirit as lies at the very foundation of popular orthodoxy? There are other declarations touching the resurrection which we will notice in another place; some from which objections are urged against the Bible doctrine of man's mortality, but which are found to be when closely examined most decidedly in its favor.

We have examined the scriptures thus far, as they stand related to man in three conditions: first, *in his creation*; second, in his death; third, in his resurrection; and in all these aspects, the plain and obvious meaning of the sacred text, has been clearly and unquestionably in favor of the view of man's being wholly composed of material—simply a living soul. And whatever has been said up to this point, to or of man, as a saint or sinner, as innocent or guilty, as the subject of rewards or punishments, touching life, death, resurrection, mortality or immortality, relates, (not, be it remembered, to an immortal soul put into man,) but to a being made of the dust of the ground, and made alive, conscious, intelligent and responsible, by the power and wisdom of God. Any objection, therefore, urged against this view of the subject, must be drawn from the supposed teachings of some obscure text, a parable, or doubtful inference; neither of which are admissible as independently proving any doctrine; much less a doctrine of the im-

portance of the one under contemplation; for, let it be borne in mind, parables, inferences, and all obscure sayings, are to be explained, so as to harmonize with the oft-repeated and plain teachings of the inspired penmen. This method of investigation not having been sufficiently adhered to, has been the occasion of a great amount of darkness and fog, which now hangs like a dense cloud over the religious world.

SOUL AND SPIRIT.

We purpose at this point in the investigation, introducing the Bible view of the soul, spirit, and immortality; and we will notice this branch of the subject under the head of objections. I have found by experience that you may collate any amount of testimony of the plainest and most obvious import, bearing upon man's condition in creation, death and resurrection, and still an objection will arise in the minds of many from the supposed signification of soul, spirit and immortality, as it is revealed in the Bible. Any objection to man's unity, mortality and materiality, originating from this source, must I think have its foundation, more in the sound which a repetition of these terms conveys to the ear, than in the sense conveyed to the understanding, by a faithful and critical investigation of them.

I would invite attention to a fact in the onset which would be profitable to note and remember; namely, that those advocating the immortality of the soul, in offering objections to the view I am en-

deavoring to present, almost invariably make a false issue. They represent us as no-soulists; as denying man a soul; and they not unfrequently fancy themselves completely triumphant, on finding the words soul, spirit and immortality, used in the scriptures in connection with man. In this case they rejoice by far too soon; for when they have made this important discovery, they are not one whit in advance of their neighbors: they too have learned these same things. Up to this point, then, all parties are agreed: there is no issue here. I am very sorry to say that a great many of those, who represent us as denying man a soul or spirit, simply because we reject their version of the matter, are just as guilty as we should be, were we to deny them a belief in the soul and spirit, simply because they do not choose to accept our version of the same. Denying their affirmation, that the soul or spirit, is an entity separate from the body, and capable of existing in or out of it, as an intelligent creature, clothed with immortality, consciousness, intelligence, responsibility, &c., is one thing; and denying that man has a soul or spirit at all, is quite another, and a different thing.

Soul and Spirit, are words which occur a number of hundred times in the Old and New Testaments, and undoubtedly mean something. But whether they point out such a little embryotic angel in man, as they are supposed to by those embracing the dominant theology, is not quite so certain. Popular theology assumes by far too much, on this very important and vital point. It is not quite enough to quote the words *soul* and *spirit*; this is doing absolutely nothing in the case. The whole

labor in the matter is still to come. All classes of Bible students believe in the soul and spirit; but all are not quite so well agreed as to what is intended by these oft repeated expressions.

Immortal and immortality, are words which occur much less frequently in the Scriptures than one would suppose from the very common use made of them by the ordinary preachers of the present time. But there is one fact, which we deem it important just here to state, and invite especial attention to it. That in all the numerous instances in which soul and spirit occur in the Old and New Testaments, not one single instance can be found where the soul is said to be immortal, or the spirit deathless. Let us stop here one moment and contemplate the relation popular theology sustains to this one fact.

The immortal soul, lies at the very foundation of modern orthodoxy. The whole superstructure is built upon it. It enters into, and constitutes the very essence of all good orthodox sermons and prayers. It furnishes a most prolific source of consolation to those who are mourning the loss of friends who have died. They contemplate their disembodied immortalities in realms of glory, with infinite satisfaction and delight. It is in fact the alpha and omega, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last; and yet after all this parade and talk about it, there is not one single "thus saith the Lord" in the entire foundation. This mighty structure, this stupendous edifice, in all its towering heights, has not upon one single stone, *immortal soul*, written by the finger of God. Is not this building upon the sand? We do most earn-

estly and affectionately entreat its friends to take it down and build upon the rock, before the winds and floods come and sweep it all away, and millions perish in its ruins.

The word *soul*, as popularly used, has one uniform and stereotyped definition, and conveys to the minds of most, invariably one idea; viz., "The immortal spirit of man," or "The deathless principle in man," "The immortal mind of man," or some other phrase meaning the same thing, which is used to point out an immortal, conscious, intelligent entity *in* man's body while living, and *out* of his body when dead. That the popular definition is not the Bible signification of this term, we will show:—

1. By citing instances where the soul is represented as being in danger of the grave. "Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning; and their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling. But God will redeem my *soul* from the power of the grave: for he shall receive me." Ps. xlix, 14, 15. "What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his *soul* from the hand of the grave." Ps. lxxxix, 48. "He keepeth back his *soul* from the pit, and his life from perishing by the sword. So that his life abhorreth bread, and his *soul* dainty meat; yea his *soul* draweth near unto the grave, and his life to the destroyer." Job. xxxiii, 18, 20, 22. See the case of the pious king, Hezekiah: "Behold for peace I had great bitterness; but thou hast in love to my *soul* delivered it from the pit of corruption; for thou

hast cast all my sins behind thy back." Isa. xxxviii, 17. These quotations are only samples of what might be adduced under this head, but are sufficient to show any candid mind that the popular definition is not admissible.

2. By citing instances where the soul is *killed, destroyed*. "And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that *soul* shall be cut off from his people: he hath broken my covenant." Gen. xvii, 14. "Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you, every one that defileth it shall surely be *put to death*, for whosoever doeth any work therein, that *soul* shall be cut off from among his people." Ex. xxxi, 14. "But the *soul* that eateth of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace offerings that pertain unto the Lord, having his uncleanness upon him, even that *soul* shall be cut off from his people." Ex. vii, 20. See also verses 21, 25, 27. And Joshua at that time turned back and took Hazor, and smote the king thereof with the sword: for Hazor beforetime was the head of all those kingdoms. And they smote all the *souls* that were therein with the edge of the sword, utterly destroying them: there was not any left to breathe: and he burnt Hazor with fire." These are only a few instances of hundreds which might be presented under this head.

In order to show most clearly the impropriety of the common notion, touching the soul, I will read the popular definitions in place of *soul*, where it occurs in a few instances; "Behold all *immortal spirits* (souls) are mine; as the *immortal spirit* (soul) of the father, so also the *immortal spirit*

(soul) of the son is mine, the *immortal spirit* (soul) that sinneth, it shall *die*." See Eze. xviii, 4, 20. If the soul goes into the grave, the pit, is cut off, destroyed, dies, is slain with the sword, loses its blood, its life, &c., how in the name of common sense can it be immortal, or deathless? Without spending more time in showing what the soul is not, we will come directly to the question. What is the *soul*? or what signification or significations has this word in the scriptures of truth?

We will make a few statements upon the authority of others, in the commencement, which we doubt not are unquestionable, and then proceed to investigate the word in its various connections in the sacred text. *Nesme* and *nephesh*, are the only words in the original of the Old Testament, which are translated soul. Taylor, in his Hebrew Concordance, says that *nesme* signifies the chameleon, a kind of lizard, which has its mouth always open gaping for air, upon which it is said to live. It is rendered *breath* and *breatheth* in the following texts, and expresses natural life whether in men or beasts. Deut. xx, 16; Josh. xi, 11, 14; 1 Kings xv, 29; xvii, 17; comp. verse 21, where the *breath* of the child is called "*his soul*."

"The Hebrew word, *nephesh*, of the Old Testament, occurs about seven hundred times, and is rendered *soul* four hundred and seventy-one times; *life* and *living* about one hundred and fifty; and the same word is also rendered a *man*, a *person*, *self*, *they*, *me*, *him*, *any one*, *breath*, *heart*, *mind*, *appetite*, *the body*, (dead or alive,) *lust*, *creature*,

and even a *beast*; for it is twenty-eight times applied to *beasts* and to *every creeping thing*."

Parkhurst says: "As a noun, *nephesh* hath been supposed to signify the spiritual part of man, or what we commonly call his soul: I must for myself confess that I can find no passage where it hath undoubtedly this meaning. Gen. xxxv, 18; 1 Kings xvii, 21, 22; Ps. xvi, 10, seem fairest for this signification. But may not *nephesh* in the three former passages be most properly rendered *breath*, and in the last a breathing or animal frame?"

Taylor says that *nephesh* signifies "the animal life, or that principle by which every animal, according to its kind, lives. Gen. i, 20. *Every moving creature that hath the soul of life*. And verse 24, *Let the earth bring forth the living creature, the soul of life*. And verse 30. *Every beast, fowl, &c., wherein there is life, the soul of life*. Lev. xi, 46. Which animal life, so far as we know anything of the manner of its existence, or so far as the scriptures lead our thoughts, consists in the *breath*. Job xii, 21; xxxi 39. And in the *blood*. Lev. xvii, 11, 14."

We see from the original of the Old Testament, that the popular *soul* has not the slightest countenance. Let us next examine the original of the New Testament.

"The Greek word *psuche*, of the New Testament, corresponds with the word *nephesh* of the Old. It occurs one hundred and five times, and is rendered *soul* fifty-nine times, and *life*, forty times. The same word is also rendered *mind*, *us*,

you, heart, heartily, and is twice applied to the beasts that perish."

If the original in the Greek be brought forward to aid in proof of the immortal soul, like its corresponding word in Hebrew, it will prove too many things immortal to answer any good purpose, and thereby prove nothing at all.

There are two words, *nesme* and *nephesh* in the Hebrew, and one, *psuche*, in the Greek, from which soul is translated.

"In tracing the word *soul* through the authorized version of the Bible, we find it occurs five hundred and thirty-two times—four hundred and seventy-six times in the Old Testament, and fifty-six times in the New. God is represented as having a *soul* sixteen times. Your new moons and appointed feasts my soul hateth. Isa. i, 14; Lev. xxvi, 11, 30; Judges x, 16; Job xxiii, 13; Ps. xi, 5; Isa. xlii 11; Jer. v, 9, 29; vi, 8; ix, 9; xii, 7, 14, 19; xxxii, 41; Zech. xi, 8; and Heb. x, 38."

"*Nephesh* is rendered *soul* four hundred and fifty-four times; and *psuche* is so rendered, fifty-seven times, making five hundred and eleven times that *nephesh* and *psuche* are rendered *soul*, when applied to man; and seventeen times in the original we find these terms applied to *beasts*. There are more than three hundred other places where the same terms are rendered life, person, or body, &c.; for had they been rendered *soul* in all such places, then the reader must have perceived that the word *soul* never could mean a something that could live separately from the man himself, neither as an 'immortal soul,' or 'deathless spirit.'"

"We say the true meaning of *soul* is, a creature that lives by breathing: and as the essential endowment of such a creature is *life*, so life will stand often as a correct meaning of soul. When *soul* is applied to man, it may be translated life, soul, man, you, yourself, person, myself, thyself, &c., according to the text."*

I have examined the word *soul* as it stands in the *King James' version*, aided by a large Concordance, and can find no instances in which one of three significations will not fairly set forth the meaning, as appears evident from the text and context.

We will select from the hundreds of occurrences, samples of each class, and arrange them in three separate columns according to the sense as appears from the subject in the text and context; and first:—for Person, Creature, Man, &c., as the case may be, and second:—for life, as it stands related to man or beast, and third:—my soul, your soul, used with reference to God and man instead of the reflexive pronouns myself, yourself, &c.

*Several of the statements given above are on the authority of a work entitled, "Bible vs. Tradition," by Aaron Ellis, revised by Thomas Read.

MAN, CREATURE,
PERSON, &c.

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a *living soul*" (living creature.) Gen. ii, 7.

"And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man; and every living soul (living creature) died in the sea." Rev. xvi, 3.

"And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the *souls* (persons) of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held." Rev. vi, 9. Compare with Rev. xx, 4, where these same *souls*, (persons) in connection with others, are raised from the dead. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the *souls* (persons) of them that

LIFE.

The language used by David in addressing Saul.

"Moreover my father, see, yea, see the skirt of thy robe in my hand; for in that I cut off the skirt of thy robe, and killed thee not, know thou and see that there is neither evil nor transgression in mine hand, and I have not sinned against thee: yet thou huntest my soul to take it." ("Soul" life) 1 Sam. xxiv, 11.

"Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his *soul* an offering for sin. . . . ("Soul" life). Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his *soul unto death*," ("Soul" life.) Isa liii, 10, 12.

See Christ's own exposition. John x, 11. "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giv-

MYSELF, YOURSELF,
THYSELF, &c.

The language of Isaac to his son Esau.

"Now therefore take, I pray thee, thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow, and go out to the field, and take me some venison; and make savory meat, such as I love, and bring it to me, that I may eat; that *my soul* may bless thee before I die." Gen. xxvii, 3, 4. "My soul" stands for *myself*.

The following is the language of God. "And I will destroy your high places, and cut down your images, and cast your carcasses upon the carcass of your idols, and *my soul* shall abhor you." "My soul"—*myself*.

"If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which is as thine *own soul* entice thee," "Own soul"—*own self*.—Deut. xiii, 6.

"Your new-moons and your appointed

were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they *lived* and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

"These be the *sons* of Leah, which she bare unto Jacob in Padan-aram, with his daughter Dinah. All the *souls* of his sons and his daughters were thirty and three."—"Souls"—sons, daughters, persons; male or female, old or young. Gen. xlii 15, 18, 22, 25-27.

"And they *smote* all the *souls* that were therein with the *edge of the sword*, utterly destroying them; there was not any left to breathe: and he burnt Hazor with fire." Smote 'souls'—persons, men, women and children. Josh. xi, 11.

"Then they that gladly received his word, were baptized: and the same

eth his life for the sheep."

"In whose hand is the *soul* (life) of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind." Job xii, 10.

"Have mercy upon me, O Lord, for I am in trouble. Mine eye is consumed with grief, yea, *my soul* and my belly. Compare verse 10. For *my life* is spent with grief." ("Soul"—life.) Ps. xxxi, 9, 10.

"To deliver their *soul* from death, and to keep them for my sake, shall *alive* in famine." ("Soul" life.) Ps. xxxiii, 19.

"Let my prayer come before thee: incline thine ear unto my cry; for *my soul* is full of trouble, and *my life* draweth nigh unto the grave." ("Soul"—life.) Ps. lxxxviii 2, 3.

"And it came to pass as her *soul* was in departing, (for she died,) that she

feasts *my soul* hither; they are a trouble unto me, I am weary to bear them." Isa. i, 14. "My soul," "me," and "I," stand for the same.

"I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, *my soul* shall be joyful in my God, for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation." Isa. lxi, 10. "I will greatly rejoice," and "my soul shall be joyful," are synonymous expressions here.

"For whosoever will seek to *save* his life shall *lose* it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake, shall find it. For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his *own soul*? or what shall a man give in exchange for his *soul*?"

Notice the same as recorded by Luke. "For whosoever will save his life, shall lose it; but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it. For what is a man advantag-

day there were added unto them about *three thousand souls*." — Persons, men, women. Acts ii, 41. Comp. 47 v. The same "souls" the Lord added to the church.

"Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him and all his kindred three-score and fifteen *souls*." — Persons, kindred, male and female. Acts vii, 14.

"And we were in all in the ship two hundred three-score and sixteen *souls*." Chap. xxvii, 37. See vs. 43, 44. "They which could swim, some on boards, &c., got to land." "Souls" swim.

"Which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, *eight souls* were saved by water." 1 Pet. iii, 20. "Souls" — persons, Noah and his family.

called his name Ben-oni; but his father called him Benjamin. And Rachel *died* and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Beth-lehem." Gen xxxv, 18, 19. "Soul departing," "life departing," "she died," are all the same.

"And fear not them which kill the body, (*soma*) but are not able to kill the soul: [*psuche*] but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul [*psuche*] and body [*soma*] in hell." (*Gehenna*.) Matt. x, 28. Compare this with Luke xii, 4, 5.

"And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that, have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear, Fear him which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you fear him."

ed, if he gain the whole world and lose *himself* or be cast away." Matt. xvi, 25, 26. Luke ix, 24, 25, "his own soul," and "himself," are the same.

Jonathan loved David as his "*own soul*." 1 Sam. xviii, 1. Compare Matt. xix, 19. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as *thyself*."

"And I will say to my soul, Soul thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided. So is he that layeth up treasure for *himself*." "My soul" "myself," "himself," all the same. — Luke xii, 19-21.

These are only a few of the many, which might be added to this list.

In concluding our investigation of the word *soul*, We invite especial attention to the last citation under the head of *life*. Matt. x, 28; Luke xii, 4. Of all the occurrences of the word *soul* in the Bible, this seems fairest for the support of the immortality of the soul, and as a consequence is seized upon by those advocating that theory, and most unceremoniously pressed into the service.

We will once more point out the fact, that they have two very important points to sustain in this controversy; first, that the soul is a separate entity from the body, and, second, that it is immortal, or deathless. The proof which might fairly sustain the first, would prove nothing for the second. To prove that the soul of man is an entity separate from the body, is one thing, and then to take this same *soul* and go forward and prove it to be intelligent, immortal, deathless, &c., is quite another thing. Now all that this text can possibly prove, is that the soul is a separate entity. But what follows is quite unfortunate for its immortality. Note: man cannot destroy it, but God can. In this view of the subject, letting the advocates of the immortality of the soul have their own way, its immortality is most clearly and fairly denied: seeing the soul is susceptible of destruction. "Fear him who is able to destroy both *soul* and *body* in hell." (*Gehenna*.) • So that if our orthodox friends press this text in proof of the soul's separate entity, or existence, we will press the same text home upon them as proving its mortality.

But we do not conceive this to be the idea in the text. The context shows most clearly that the present existence or life is contrasted with the fu-

ture existence or life. One is in the power of man, to take away; (kill, murder, &c.) the other is not, but is in the power of God. Luke throws light upon Matt., (comp. Matt. x, 28, with Luke xii, 4,) and shows both lives or existences to be in the power of God. "Fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him." Now what is it which is cast into Gehenna for destruction? The same that is killed, remember; but it is evident by comparing parallel passages, that here, as elsewhere, the present life or being, is contrasted with the future life or being.

In this same connection see Matt. x, 39. "He that findeth his life (*psuche*) shall lose it: and he that loseth his life (*psuche*) for my sake, shall find it." Let us look at this. Can a man find his immortal soul, by losing his immortal soul? This would be perfect nonsense. Let us look again. Can a man lose this present life and find this present life by the same act? This would not be possible. Look again. Can a man lose this present *psuche* (life or being) and gain a future *psuche*, (life or existence,) and *vice versa*? This he could do, and this is the sense in which this very hard text is to be understood. The future life, (*psuche*), being, God can take away, deprive us of, as well as the present; but the power of man, or all men combined, cannot reach it. This was the soul, (*psuche*), life or being, referred to in the text. There are numerous texts of like import, some of which we will note. Matt. xvi, 25; Mark viii, 35; Luke ix, 24.

We call especial attention to John xii, 25. "He

that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal. The soul, life or being, of the faithful who are not ashamed of Christ in this sinful and adulterous generation, those who will even lose the present life, if necessary, in order to their faithfulness, is hid with Christ in God; and "when Christ, who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. iii, 3, 4.

Having noticed the uses of the word *soul* in its various significations, and finding no proof for the popular orthodox notion concerning it, and finding immortal and immortality almost universally associated with it, in popular style, we are led to investigate the sense in which these terms are used in the Bible.

We never find *immortal soul*, or immortality of the soul, in the Bible; but we find any amount of such expressions in orthodox writings. The term *immortal*, is found but once in the whole Bible, and there instead of being used to point out a *soul* in MAN, it is used with reference to GOD. Instead of the expression, "All men have immortality," we find the declaration that God only hath immortality—quite a contrast: sufficient I should think to lead the candid to search further upon this point.

"Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory, forever and ever. Amen." Immortality occurs five times only, as follows: Rom. ii, 6, 7, "Who will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, honor and immortality; eternal

life;" but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, quite another fate. Here then is a broad line drawn, between the two classes. Two very different fates await them, depending entirely upon their respective characters in this present life. Immortality is here held out as a precious boon, to be conferred, not on the *soul* as an abstract ghost, but on man, the whole man, as a reward rendered by God himself at the end of the race.

"To them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for immortality," sounds quite unlike the unqualified assumption, that all men have it inherently in the shape of deathless ghosts, and thereby rendering every effort put forth for the attainment of it, entirely useless and vain. "For what a man seeth," says the apostle Paul, "why doth he yet *hope* for? but if we hope for that we see not, then do we with *patience wait for it*." Rom. viii, 24, 25.

The grand reason why more are not *patiently waiting* for immortality, I apprehend to be explained here most satisfactorily: they think they have it. If all men have it, as commonly affirmed, why, we ask in the name of reason, are we commanded to seek for it? Will some one learned in this philosophy, please explain?

The second occurrence, which we will now examine is recorded, 1 Cor. xv, 53. "For this corruptible must *put on* incorruption, and this mortal must *put on* immortality."

Verse 54. Third occurrence. "So when this corruptible, shall have *put on* incorruption, and this mortal shall have *put on* immortality, then

shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." See where these sayings are written. Isa. xxv, 8; Hos. xiii, 14. In these two instances immortality is to be *put on*—very inappropriate language, indeed, if an immortal soul in man's body comes in for a share in these declarations. Verses 51, 52, show when this transaction is to take place. "Behold I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, [die,] but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." Note, first: All the declarations here made, relate to the entire man, who is declared to be mortal, and corruptible. It is this entire organism, physical, intellectual, and moral, which undergoes a complete and entire change from mortality and corruptibility to immortality and incorruptibility. There is no mixing up or mingling of mortality with immortality as would be the case if man was a compound of mortality and immortality, as is almost universally affirmed. This is all completely shut out, by the use here made of these terms.

Note, second: The time appointed by Heaven, for this transaction to take place: at the sounding of the last trump. See 1 Thess. iv, 16. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trump of God." "For the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we [that is, the living] shall be changed." "And the dead in Christ shall rise first, [i. e., before the living are changed,] then we which are alive and re-

main, shall be caught up together with them [the living who had been raised] in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

Note, third: "Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, "Death is swallowed up in victory, O death where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory?" Then. When? When this mortal coil drops off, and the emancipated spirit claps its glad wings and soars away to the bright realms of glory? No! When this mortal puts on immortality; when the grave gives up its dead, and corruption is swallowed up of incorruption, and mortality of unending life. Then this triumphant shout can be raised by the redeemed ones, whose immortal voices will cause the heavenly arches to resound. This victorious song is sung by most, by far too soon. How absurd to shout victory just at the instant the enemy, death, is completely vanquishing us! Before leaving the Apostle's reasonings in this place upon the subject of mortality, immortality, &c., we invite attention to verses 45-47.

Verse 45. "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit."

Verse 46. "Howbeit, that was not *first* which is *spiritual*, but that which was *natural*; and afterwards that which is *spiritual*."

Verse 47. "The first man is of the *earth*, earthy; the second man is the *Lord from heaven*."

In the three verses above quoted, there are several important points stated worthy of note. 1. Two men are introduced, named, the *first Adam*

and the *second Adam*. 2. Their origin: the first, of the *earth*; the second from heaven. 3. Their respective natures: the first a *living soul*, of the earth, natural: the second, a quickening spirit (a life-giving spirit,) the Lord from heaven, spiritual. 4. The order in which these two men stand: the living soul, of the earth, natural, first in the order; afterwards, the quickening spirit, the Lord from heaven, spiritual. These two Adams stand out, as the representatives of two families. Now as these two persons are separate the one from the other entirely, with no mixing or mingling, so are their children. The second Adam comes on after the first Adam, and takes his, the first Adam's children, (living souls,) and by a process of begetting and birth, quite unlike the former, brings them out with an entirely new and different nature throughout. The children of the first, begotten of corruptible seed, are born living souls, of the earth, earthy, natural. The children of the second, begotten of incorruptible seed, the word of God, are born incorruptible, immortal. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh: that which is born of the spirit is spirit."

"But if the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. viii, 11. For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap *corruption*: (not an immortal soul:) but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap *life everlasting*. (Not in the shape of an immortal soul, but in the shape of life manifested through an incorruptible body.) "This

mortal shall put on immortality." Our orthodox friends have made one grand mistake upon the question of immortality which is here made manifest; i. e., they have given this glorious work to the first, earthly, soul Adam, instead of to the second, heavenly, spirit Adam. This is the work of the Lord from heaven, and not the man of earth. God only hath natural and inherent immortality. He hath life in himself, and hath given it to his Son Jesus Christ, the Lord from heaven, to have life in himself; and he gives it upon certain conditions to those who are finally immortalized. Immortality, incorruptibility and endless life, are all glorious attributes of the atonement, the kingdom of God, and will be enjoyed throughout the endless ages, by those who patiently continue in well doing here, and seek for them through the second Adam. These glorious blessings are a part of that great recompense of reward. We pass from this, the third occurrence of the word immortality, to notice the two remaining ones.

1 Tim. vi, 15, 16. "Which in his time he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords: who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen." Notwithstanding the Bible plainly declares that God only possesses inherent immortality, men have dared to drag this glorious attribute of Jehovah down from his throne in heaven, and fix it on every man of dust, no matter how low or vile he may be. This is not the only act of the kind: not satisfied with claiming God's attributes

they rob him of his titles. "Reverend and holy is his name," is a title belonging exclusively to Jehovah, and only once used in the Bible. This sacred appellation, like immortality, is rendered common and profane by being torn from the High and Holy One, and applied to popes, cardinals, and priests of every character and grade.

2 Tim. i, 10. "But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." This makes five occurrences of the word, immortality: all there are in the authorized version of the Old and New Testaments. This is the last one and deserves a careful examination. Life and immortality are here declared to be brought to light through the gospel. "Life and immortality," as Tillotson remarks, "is a Hebraism for *immortal life*." Immortal life then is brought to light through the gospel. How then if this be true, can it be said to be clearly an attribute of sinful flesh? How can it be urged as being clearly apparent, in the nature and constitution of man? If the gospel, (which is defined by Jesus, and holy apostles, to be glad tidings concerning the kingdom of God, of which kingdom immortal life is an attribute, and only of this kingdom,) if this gospel, I say, was necessary to set this matter in a clear light, or bring it to the understanding and light of man, how can it be said to be made clear in the record of creation? If the gospel is the place to look for the clear and certain light upon this all-important theme, let us turn our eyes in that direction and see what we can behold in its teachings and

promises touching this interesting topic. It is certainly important that we inquire patiently and perseveringly after its *true source*, seeing it is such a glorious blessing for mortal dying man. We invite attention to the record God gave of his Son. 1 John v, 10-12. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God, hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, [immortal life,] and this life is in his Son!! He that hath the Son, hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life." There are four points clearly and fairly stated in this record. 1. God has given us eternal life. 2. It is in his Son. 3. Those who have the Son, have it in him. 4. Those who have not the Son, have no hold on this life. The conclusion is inevitable that all of the last named class must *perish*. This life is in his *Son*; how then can it be said to be in *all men*? Look at the contrast between Bible and creed. Bible. This life is in his Son. Creed. This life is in all men, in the shape of immortal ghosts. There is a way plainly marked out, for obtaining this life. We must have the Son by *faith*, until faith ends; then this life will pass out of the Son into those who have had the faith. This life will be given to the faithful, not in the shape of an "immortal soul" or "deathless spirit," but in the gift of a body "fashioned like unto his glorious body," through which this life can be endlessly manifested. See John iii, 14, 15. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up,

that whosoever *believeth in him* should not *perish*, but have eternal life. [Immortal life.] See verse 36. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, [how? in actual possession, in himself? No: by faith in the Son: he has hold of the promise,] and he that believeth not the Son, *shall not see life*." But he that believeth on the Son shall see this life, when *faith* is swallowed up of *sight*, and *hope* of glad fruition. This life is a matter of faith and hope then in the present time. See Tit. i, 2. "In hope of *eternal life*, which God that cannot lie *promised* before the world began." See a promise which Jesus, the Life-giver made: Mark x, 29, 30. "And Jesus answered and said, verily I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sister, or father, or mother, or children, or lands, for my sake and the gospel's, but he shall receive an hundred fold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, *with persecutions; and in the world to come, eternal life*." John. vi, 40. "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, *may have everlasting life*, and I will *raise him up*, at the last day." Any desired amount of similar texts in the gospel promises might be collated upon this interesting and important theme.

Immortal life, only through Jesus Christ, the life-giver, is a doctrine which lies at the very foundation of the plan of redemption, and when scripturally apprehended, sweeps away, completely and for ever, every false system of religion and philosophy in Christendom.

The next theme to be investigated in the plan

marked out, is the "spirit." We see by examination, that any hope erected on the theory of an "immortal soul," is baseless, without foundation in the word of God. It is a germ of heathenism, nursed and brought up by the church, first by the Catholic and then by the Protestant, until it has got to be a monster, threatening the destruction of everything like pure gospel, which lies in its course, and rapidly preparing the way for one of the grandest and most complete deceptions the world has ever known. We will next examine the proof attempted to be brought from this source. Has man a deathless spirit? What does the word *spirit*, mean, as it stands in the Bible?

The word *spirit*, like the word *soul*, in popular style, has one stereotyped and definite idea attached to it. In theology, spirit is defined to be the soul; and the "immortal soul" is defined to be the "deathless spirit." Spirit is soul, and soul is spirit; and so we might play from one term to the other everlastingly, and who would be the wiser.

The spirit, then, is the same little embryotic angel, the same deathless, intelligent entity, that the *soul* was in our previous investigations. Has man, then, connected with his visible and tangible, material entity, another invisible, intangible, immaterial, spirit entity? so that he is two men in one man? two entities, and yet but one man? dead and alive at the same time? in heaven and in the grave, or in hell and in the grave, at one and the same time? These would seem to be very curious queries to one unlearned in the sublime inconsistencies of popular theology.

Man has a spirit, it is confidently urged; there-

fore the *unity* and *mortality* of man cannot be true. That man has a spirit, be it distinctly remembered, is admitted on all hands. The controversy does not turn upon this point. Those who hold to the immortal soul, or deathless spirit, would be glad to have this recognized as the issue, and they do very frequently represent it as such; but this is not the truth! I should be glad to see the minds of the honest disabused upon this point. Popular theologians would like to fix no-soulism, no-spiritism, upon those who call upon them to prove the soul immortal, and the spirit deathless. They find it much more convenient to turn to the word spirit, in their Bibles, than to find proof that the spirit is an intelligent and deathless creature, separate from the body.

The query, then, is not whether man has a spirit, but what does the word *spirit* so frequently used in the Old and New Testaments, mean? The word *spirit*, like other words in the Bible and other books, does not invariably convey the same shade of meaning. The signification is to be determined by an examination of the subject, and context. Before tracing this word through the Bible, and trying to ascertain its various significations, we will examine its original import. *Ruah* is the original Hebrew, and *pneuma* the original Greek word translated spirit. *Ruah* is derived from *ruah*, "to blow," and *nesme*, "to breathe," and signifies, primarily, wind, air, breath. *Pneuma* is derived from *pneo*, "to breathe," "to blow," and signifies the same as the Hebrew *ruah*.

There is nothing, then, in the original import of these terms, to favor the idea of the spirit's being

an intelligent creature, much less an immortal or deathless one, but quite the contrary.

We will note the fact in the first place, that not only man, but the beasts have a spirit. "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" Eccl. iii, 21. If the spirit is an immortal or deathless creature, capable of existing out of, and independently of, the body, then beasts are in possession of such a nature: the only observable difference is, the place of destination: man's spirit goes up, and the beast's goes down. It is the same spirit: they pass, it is true, into different localities at death. The same is urged of the spirits of men: all do not go to the same place; so we must not only have a heaven and hell for the spirits of good and bad men, but we must have another place for the spirits of beasts; and why send them all to one and the same locality, seeing their characters in life are quite different: some are disobedient and vicious, while others are mild and obedient.

In the original phrases, applied to all creatures, there is no distinction. Gen. vi, 17. "And behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy *all flesh*, wherein is the (*ruah chayim*—*spirit of lives*, or) breath of life, from under heaven: and every thing that is in the earth shall die." Gen. vii, 15. "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh wherein is the (*ruah chayim*—*spirit of lives*) breath of life." Verse 21. "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that

creepeth upon the earth, and every man." Verse 22. "All in whose nostrils was the (*neshmeth ruah chayim*—*breath of the spirit of lives*), breath of life, of all that was in the dry land died." Verse 23. "And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things." All without distinction are classed together. The same *spirit* animates all. If it is a living creature in *one*, it is in *all*; and more than this, if the spirit be a *living creature*, it *died* also; for all the living creatures in the earth died, except Noah and his family, and those in the ark with him.

1. THE TERM SPIRIT SIGNIFIES BREATH. James ii, 26. "For as the body without the *spirit* (margin, *breath*) is dead, so faith without works is dead also." The body is made alive by the *breath*, (*spirit*), so faith is made *alive* by works. Job xxvii, 3. "All the while my *breath* is in me, and the *spirit* of God is in my nostrils." (Margin, the *breath* which God gave him.) Rev xi, 11. "And after three days and an half the Spirit of life (*breath of life*) from God entered into them." Isa. xlii, 5. "Thus saith God the Lord, he that created the heavens, and stretched them out; he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth *breath* unto the people upon it, and the *spirit* to them that walk therein." In this parallelism *spirit* and *breath* mean the same.

Eze. xxxvii, 5. "Behold I will cause *breath* to enter into you, and ye shall *live*."

Verse 6. "And put *breath* in you and ye shall *live*."

"8. "But there was no *breath* in them."

"9. "Come from the four *winds*, O *breath*,

and *breathe* upon these slain that they may *live*."

"10. "And the *breath* came into them, and they *lived*."

Verse 14, is an explanation of all these occurrences of *breath*. "And shall put my *spirit* in you and ye shall *live*."

Eccl. iii, 21. "Who knoweth the spirit (breath) of man that goeth upward, (is breathed out upward) and the spirit (breath) of the beast, that goeth downward (is breathed out downward towards the earth) to the earth." The spirits of these two classes, man and beast, are declared in verse 19, to be *breath*: "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts: even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one (*ruah*—spirit, or) *breath*." The same word (*ruah*) occurs in the three instances, and should have been uniformly translated. Numerous instances of like import might be adduced under this head, these are brought forward as samples merely.

2. THE TERM SPIRIT SIGNIFIES LIFE. Job xxxiv, 14, 15. "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his *spirit* (life) and his *breath*; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto *dust*." Eccl. xii, 7. "Then shall the *dust* return to the earth as it was: and the *spirit* (breath or life) return unto God who gave it"—as it was. "And man go to his long home"—into the grave. Eze. i, 20. "For the spirit (life) of the living creature was in the wheels." (Margin, life.) See the same in verse 21. See the same in Eze. x, 17. Luke viii, 54, 55. "And he put them all out, and took her by the hand, and

called, saying, Maid, arise. And her spirit, (life,) came again, and *she arose*." Ps. xxxi, 5. "Into thine hand I commit my spirit. (Life.)

We will notice all the places where the death of Christ is recorded: See Matt. xxvii, 50. "Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the *ghost*." Mark xv, 37. "And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the *ghost*." Luke xxiii, 46. "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my *spirit*; (life:;) and having said thus, he gave up the *ghost*." John xix, 30. "When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished; and he bowed his head, and gave up the *ghost*."

We have cited four instances of giving up the ghost, and now inquire what it means. Parkhurst in his Greek and English Lexicon says, "And it may be worth remarking that the leading sense of the old English word *ghost*, is *breath*, and is from the same root with *gust* of wind; and that both these words are plain derivatives from a Hebrew word signifying to move with violence; whence also *gust*." Bible vs. Tradition, *giving up of the ghost*, (margin,) Parkhurst translates, a puff of breath; Good, a scattered breath; Prof. Pick, "Breathed out the breath. To give up the ghost, is to breathe out the breath, the life." Acts vii, 59, 60. Stephen calls upon the Lord Jesus to receive his spirit, (life,) but Stephen *fell asleep* (or died.) Numerous instances where the sense of spirit is life, might be cited. To give up the spirit, to commend the spirit into the hands of God, is to resign the life. The life of the christian is

hid with Christ in God, and when he who is our life shall appear, they will also appear with him in glory.

3. THE TERM SPIRIT, STANDS FOR MIND, THOUGHTS, AFFECTIONS, TEMPER, DISPOSITION. Gen xli, 8. "And it came to pass in the morning, that his *spirit* was troubled. (His mind perplexed.) Ex. vi, 9. "But they hearkened not unto Moses, for anguish of spirit, (of mind.) 1 Kings xxi, 4, 5, 7. The circumstance which occurred between Naboth, and Ahab king of Israel and Jezebel his wife. Verse 3. "And Naboth said to Ahab, The Lord forbid it me, that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee. And Ahab came into his house, heavy and displeased. But Jezebel, his wife, came to him, and said unto him, *Why is thy spirit so sad?*" Verse 7. "Arise, and eat bread, and let thine heart be merry." Place the expressions, "heavy and displeased," "spirit so sad," and "heart be merry," side by side, and I think no one will fail to see the signification of spirit in this case. 1 Tim. iv, 12. "Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in *spirit*, in faith, in purity." In *spirit*, (in temper, disposition, &c.) Col. ii, 5. "For though I be absent in the *flesh* yet I am with you in the *spirit*, joying and beholding your order; and the steadfastness of your faith in Christ." "With you in *spirit*." Does this teach that the Apostle's deathless, thinking spirit left his body and went to another locality on a visit, and there rejoiced with the brethren, &c. If so, Paul must have been a dead man during the interval; for

James says, The body without the spirit is dead. The idea I apprehend to be simply this: Paul's mind, thoughts, &c., were with them: he remembered them, though absent from them. This phrase in any other book could be very easily understood; but the Bible some people apprehend is not to be dealt with in a rational manner! sad mistake!! If in addressing my friend by letter, I should say, though absent from you many hundred miles, yet am I with you in spirit, no one would dream of any possible misunderstanding. Ps. li, 10. "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right *spirit*, [disposition.] within me." Rom. viii, 9. "Now if any man have not the spirit [disposition] of Christ, he is none of his." Prov. xvi, 32. "He that ruleth his spirit, [temper,] than he that taketh a city." Eph. iv, 23 "And be renewed in the spirit of your mind." (Renewed in disposition) Many more such instances might be brought under this head, but these will suffice for samples.

4. THE TERM SPIRIT, STANDS FOR THE WHOLE PERSON. John iv, 24. "*God is a Spirit.*" God is certainly a personal being. See Heb. i, 3. "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of *his person*." Whose person? God's. See verses 1 and 2. The Son of God, Jesus of Nazareth, is a Spirit! 1 Cor. xv, 45. "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a *living soul*, the last Adam was made a *quickeningspirit*." The angels are spirits. Heb. i, 14. "Are they not all ministering spirits?" The angels are certainly personal beings. See Ps. lxxviii, 25. "Man did eat angel's food." Gen. xix, 1. And

there came two angels to Sodom. "Lot saw them asked them to tarry over night, and wash their feet." They did eat, they lay down, they took hold of the hand of Lot, &c. Read the chapter. Gen. xxxii, 1. "And Jacob went on his way and the angels of God met him." "He said, This is God's host." The whole history of angels, shows most conclusively that they are personal beings. They are called *spirits*.

The saints when born again, will be spirits. John iii, 6. "That which is born of the flesh *is* flesh; [not a compound of flesh and spirit;] and that which is born of the Spirit *is* spirit." (Not a compound of flesh and spirit.) Again, Christ is a quickening spirit, an immortal and incorruptible person, or being. The saints at the first resurrection are to have bodies like his glorious body; i. e., immortal and incorruptible. Again, see Luke xx, 35. "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, [out from among the dead ones,] neither marry nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more; [or again;] for they are equal unto the angels." They too are spirits.

1 John iv, 1-5. "Beloved, believe not every spirit, [person,] but try the spirits, [persons,] whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world." The false prophets, are the spirits referred to. They are not invisible or intangible. You may see them any day in these times. Heb. xii, 9. "Shall we not rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live." 1 Pet. iii, 18-21. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that

he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which also [i. e., by the same Spirit which made Jesus alive] he went and preached to the *spirits* in prison." (Persons in the prison house of death.) When did this same Spirit that quickened Jesus preach to the persons now dead? When once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah. The recorded transaction runs like this: God by his Spirit moved upon righteous Noah, who by the Spirit of God in him, warned the wicked antediluvians of their coming doom. They were destroyed. The spirits in prison, are those wicked ones in death, in the prison house of death.

In concluding upon this topic we will notice three other instances of the word spirit where it has evidently another signification: Matt. xiv, 26. "And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a *spirit*; and they cried out for fear." Mark vi, 49. "But when they saw him walking upon the sea, they supposed it had been a *spirit*, and cried out." Luke xxiv, 37. "But they were terrified, and affrighted, and supposed they had seen a *spirit*." Verse 39. "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see: for a *spirit* hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." In the three instances above quoted, the word *spirit* is from the Greek, *phantasma*, not *pneuma*, as in other places, and signifies a *phantom*; that is, an appearance, an optical illusion, or an apparition. Parkhurst in giving the significations of *pneuma*, mentions a great variety of uses. 1. The material spirit, or air in motion. 2. The human soul or

spirit. 3. Temper, disposition of the soul, &c. The Spirit of God, of Christ, of adoption; the Spirit of grace, of truth, of promise; the spirit of the law; and so on to almost any extent.

Now from the various uses of the word spirit, we would like to know which is the little embryo-angel in man? Is there a single instance in which the word spirit points out an entity in man's body? This is the first request, and the mildest form in which it can be presented. If spiritualists cannot point us to one thus saith the Lord, for this, if this cannot be proved, every thing built upon it must of course fall. A great many get the cart before the horse, to use a homely phrase. They talk very largely and fluently about the immortality, deathlessness, intelligence, responsibility, powers, and attributes of the spirit, without so much as offering one single proof, touching the existence of such a spirit entity. Let such do one thing at a time, and commence at the right place. First, prove the existence of such an entity in man; then prove its intelligence, immortality and deathlessness; and lastly, that it can leave the body and carry off all its intelligence, responsibility, &c., and exist as an intelligent creature, independently of the body. Here is work enough to last such some time. The significations of the word spirit as it is used in the Bible, will certainly furnish them little aid. Every single instance is a death blow to such a view.

In closing our remarks upon the signification of the word spirit, we invite attention to the fact that the word spirit is frequently used in scripture to point out a principle, or essence, which pervades

the atmosphere, and perhaps all space, giving life and energy to all created intelligences. It is the vital principle in the breath or atmosphere which when inhaled magnetizes the blood, and imparts to it its life. It is not the air itself, but it is in it. It is not the life itself, but the cause of it. It is not the mind, the thoughts, &c., but it is the principle which operates upon the brain, and causes all mental phenomena. It is not the life, intelligence and sensation, but that which, when brought in contact with the organized man, produces all these.

After having examined the words soul and spirit as faithfully as my limits will allow, I am confident that not the slightest countenance to the popular soul and spirit can be found in the Bible. Its origin must be traced to some other source. Its true source is easily determined. We will inquire after its origin in another place: suffice it to say just now, that it does not find its origin in the teachings of holy writ.

The words soul and spirit are frequently used, and we believe all that the prophets, Jesus and the apostles, affirmed of them, most willingly and faithfully; but we are by no means bound to believe all that the heathen, unenlightened by wisdom from above, may affirm; nor all that a corrupt Roman Catholic, or Protestant church may attach to them in their catechisms and creeds: especially seeing that they cannot adduce one single thus saith the Lord for their entire theory upon this subject. We do most earnestly and candidly ask for one single text of scripture which declares the soul or spirit to be an intelligent creature in man, or one

single text which declares the soul to be immortal, or the spirit deathless. If no such scripture can be adduced, why will the honest and conscientious believers in the perfection of the holy Scriptures, longer cling to this Heathen and Roman Catholic tradition!

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

Having examined the most formidable and oft repeated objections to the *materiality, unity and mortality of man*, viz., that growing out of the use of words, *soul and spirit*, and having seen a great discrepancy between the popular and Bible signification of these terms, so much so, that the scripture view is not in the slightest degree objectionable, we are prepared to go forward and notice other objections of a less formidable character, which are almost invariably urged against this same Bible doctrine.

They are, (1.) The Rich man and Lazarus. Luke xvi. (2.) The thief on the cross. Luke xxiii, 43. (3.) Objections drawn from different expressions of the apostle Paul; viz., This tabernacle; his desire to depart; in the body or out; the inner man. See 2 Cor. v, 1; Phil. i, 21; 2 Cor. xii, 4; iv, 16. (4.) Moses and Elias. Matt. xvii, 3. (5.) Christ and the Sadducees. Luke xx, 27.

The above is a list of the principal ones: others of minor importance are sometimes urged; but these are mainly in the way of those who cannot at once embrace the view of man's unity and mortality. If these can be removed out of the way by a fair and candid investigation and comparison of scripture with scripture, many who are

now halting, will, we doubt not, immediately and heartily embrace the view we are now advocating as the Bible view.

In order to prepare our minds to understand the nature and force of the objections we are now about to canvass, let us consider again what has been proved by the very plainest Bible testimony; viz., That *man* is a *unit*, composed of *dust*, his *mental and moral* nature inhering in the *organized man*. That death reduces the entire man to a state of unconsciousness, when all his functions, physical, mental and moral, cease. That the entire man is mortal. That immortality is the gift of God through Jesus Christ, to the faithful only, to be conferred at the second coming of Christ, and the resurrection of the just. All the above named positions are sustained by plain Bible evidence, and if the objections named, or any others, are urged, they must bear against one or all of these positions.

Any person, who regards the Bible as a book of truth, and Bible writers as inspired of God, must see that the Book cannot teach two doctrines touching the same thing: it is not *yea* and *ay*; one thing in one place, and another thing in other places; Christ against Christ, and Paul against Paul; nor yet, Paul and Christ against Isaiah: all must bear uniform and harmonious testimony, touching the same thing; hence there can be no real objections to the harmonious testimony of all the inspired penmen. There may be some passages and circumstances which at first sight appear to be objectionable; but they cannot be really so, without destroying the testimony of the wit-

nesses. I have frequently conversed with those who professed to believe the Bible, and yet did not recognize this important fact. They would admit the application of many passages used in support of the doctrine of man's mortality, and at the same time assert that there were other passages equally plain which taught a contrary doctrine. This certainly would destroy the testimony of all such witnesses, if there were any such. We repeat it then, that there are no real objections to the doctrine of man's complete mortality. That there are some few passages from which an inference unfavorable to this view *can* be drawn, we do not doubt. That some parable can be tortured into the service of an opposite doctrine, I shall not question; but that the Scriptures, when fairly examined in their several connections, and compared one with another, teach any other doctrine, I do not believe can be made to appear.

With these remarks I will proceed to an examination of those passages which at first sight appear to some to teach a contrary doctrine; viz., That there is an entity dwelling in the mortal body, called soul or spirit, which is immortal, conscious, intelligent, and which, at the death of the body, goes out of it with its immortality and intelligence unimpaired, to the spheres, heaven, hell, or some other locality. We will commence with the first one named in the list; viz.,

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

This discourse of our Saviour is supposed to teach the popular doctrine of the entity, immortality, and consciousness of the soul or spirit. If it

does so teach, we are free to admit that it is a real and difficult objection to dispose of; and not only so, but we are as free to admit that the Bible writers conflict with one another. If this case proves man conscious in death, it plainly contradicts Job, David, Solomon, Daniel, Paul, and even Jesus himself, in other places. But before admitting all that popular theology claims for this case, let us carefully and candidly examine the nature of the proof. 1st. It is claimed to be all a literal narration of facts which have occurred; and, 2d. When this claim cannot be sustained, it is claimed to be partly affirmed of the body, and partly of the soul or spirit. Let us look at the first affirmation. Is it a literal history? This cannot be; if so, *the literal angels* from the courts above came down to earth and conveyed *dead Lazarus, covered with sores to Abraham's bosom, literally*. The rich man, after being buried, talks to Abraham concerning Lazarus and his five brethren. There is a great gulf literally lying between the two parties, which is impassable, and all this literal narration!! Other points equally objectionable to its being a literal history might be pointed out, but this is sufficient. Let us notice the second position, viz., that part of the narrative relates to men embodied, and part to souls or spirits disembodied. Let us read the transaction and see. Luke xvi, 19. There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day, (this is affirmed of a man embodied,) and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich

man's table: moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores. (All this is affirmed most certainly of the poor man embodied.)

Just at this point in the narrative, the scene changes, and disembodied souls become the actors, according to current theology; but let us read on and see if there is any evidence of this: "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, (this relates to his body,) and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." (This relates to the soul.) Is there the slightest evidence for this assumption? The rich man also died, (this refers to his body,) and was buried; (what does this refer to? his soul? It certainly must if the Lazarus that was not buried, but carried by the angels to Abraham's bosom, refers to the soul of Lazarus, as is affirmed, then the rich man that was not carried there, but buried, must refer to his soul;) and in hell (the hades, grave or place where the dead are deposited) he (who? the rich man, or the rich man's soul, let us see) lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus (not his soul) in his bosom; and he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on *me*, and send Lazarus, (not his soul) that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for *I* am tormented in this flame."

Read the whole, and you will see that Lazarus, in order to visit and warn the rich man's five brethren, must have a resurrection from the dead. How could this be, if it relates to the immortal soul or spirit? The truth is, not one single syllable in the entire transaction, relates to souls or spirits disembodied, but to two men embodied: it was Abraham, five brethren, the rich man, and the

poor man, as embodied men, which are interested in the affair, and not their abstract ghosts, as is affirmed in order to make it appear objectionable.

Now I would like to know how any one can squeeze an objection from this, without showing that it relates to disembodied souls or spirits. I will hold myself ready to acknowledge this as a real objection, if any man living can show it to relate in any way to immortal souls. This narrative reads right straight on through into Abraham's bosom the same, no change; and so of the rich man: he lives, dies, is buried in his grave, (not the popular hell,) talks, has organs of speech, wishes water, &c., &c.; not the slightest intimation of any change from men to immaterial souls—this is all read in, in order to read it out. If we attempt to give an exposition of this, it will all be gratis, for we are not called upon to do it in order to defend from objections the doctrine we are teaching.

The case under consideration affirms nothing touching the *souls* or *spirits* of either the rich man, or the poor man. The whole is affirmed of the two men bodily, so that no objection can be fairly deduced from this circumstance at all. Why object this to the complete mortality of man? It is certain, beyond reasonable doubt that all is affirmed of *men embodied*, and not of *souls* or *spirits* disembodied. We might drop this matter here, and pronounce it no objection, without incurring the censure of the discerning and unprejudiced; but we are willing to go further, and offer an explanation, of this very difficult discourse.

And first, we urge that it is *parabolic*, and give but one reason; viz., no man ever has, and never can

explain it as being strictly literal, and make sense. Those who assert it to be literal, will invariably make it figurative before they finish the discourse. We might multiply reasons to any desirable extent in proof of its figurative character, but this must suffice for want of space and time. And second, we urge that it relates to Jews and Gentiles, and is to be explained according to the rule given by Jesus, Mark iv, 13. This rule requires a fact, for every distinct and important specification in the figure. The rich man and his five brethren stand as the representatives of the Father's House: the rich man for the fragment, then known as the Jewish nation, and the five brethren as the representatives of the supposed lost tribes, (the ten tribes,) each brother represents two tribes, they would therefore represent, twelve tribes: the poor man as the representative of the Gentiles in their starving condition, as it regarded the true riches of truth, &c. The death of the two men, represents the change of condition, effected by a change of dispensations: the rich man lost much in this change, and the poor man gained much. So of the classes which they represented, and so on to the end. We might carry this matter out in detail and show that it perfectly corresponds, as far as any figure can, with the facts touching the Jews and Gentiles, change of dispensations, and consequent change of the condition of the two classes. We would be pleased to go into a minute examination of every limb of this parable, even the most minute, but this must suffice for the present, as I have only time, and room to notice the objectionable features, and give brief expositions.

THE THIEF ON THE CROSS. LUKE XXIII, 42, 43.

The 42d verse records his *prayer* as follows: "And he said unto Jesus, Lord remember ME, when THOU COMEST into thy kingdom." Not as it should read in order to contain the objection, that many in vain try to draw from it. It should read after this fashion: Lord, remember my *immortal soul* when thy immortal soul leaves the body to go to heaven. The 43d verse, records the answer as follows: "And Jesus said unto HIM, Verily I say unto THEE, To-day shalt THOU be with ME in paradise."

It should read, after this fashion, to answer the objector's purpose: Verily I say unto you, your immortal soul, shall leave your body and accompany my immortal soul to heaven this day, after our bodies die.

This circumstance of the promise of Christ, to the penitent thief is supposed by many to teach something concerning the soul or spirit, its immortality, &c.; but not a single syllable can be found in the whole affair: the whole is assumed: not one item of proof, save a little dot with a curl to it, called a comma. It is Lord, remember *me*. *Thou* shalt be with *me* in paradise, or my kingdom; which is the same. Let the comma be placed after To-day, and the mighty objection vanishes, like dew in sun shine: Verily I say unto thee to-day, shalt thou be with me in paradise; or, I will remember you when I come into my kingdom.

It is a very easy matter to show that paradise and the kingdom are promises to be fulfilled in the future. The prayer related to the future, and the promise when fully expressed, would be, I promise you at this time, (when all human probabilities are

against my claims to the kingdom,) that when I come in my kingdom, or when paradise is restored, you shall be remembered, or shall have a part therein. The comma, or punctuation, is the only thing in the way of this exposition, and is this inspiration? Certainly not; and how much confidence ought we to put in any punctuation which requires an entire perversion of the plain statements in the text and context? Certainly not much.

It is an easy matter to show a number of instances in which the punctuation as it now stands in our Bibles, destroys the sense entirely. Much might be said upon this interesting circumstance of the thief and his penitence, faith, &c.; but suffice it for the present to say that nothing can be brought from this circumstance to object to man's mortality, or in any way to sustain the immortality of the soul or the deathlessness of the spirit: seeing these themes are not even so much as once named therein.

EXPRESSIONS OF PAUL.

The third, in the order of objections, is, different expressions drawn from the writings of the apostle Paul; viz., *This Tabernacle*. 2 Cor. v, 1-11. *His desire to depart*. Phil. i, 21-23. *The inner man*. 2 Cor. iv, 16. *In the body or out*. 2 Cor. xii, 4. We class these all together for the purpose of comparing Paul with Paul. We believe this great Apostle taught but one doctrine concerning man's nature: all these expressions are to be so harmonized and explained as not to cause the Apostle to conflict with himself; to be *yea* and *ay*: this he positively denied saying as recorded, [2 Cor. i, 17, 18,] When I therefore was thus minded, did I use

lightness? or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that with me there should be yea, yea, and nay, nay? But as God is true, our word, (or preaching, see margin,) toward you was not yea and nay. See verses 19 and 20.

The question to be propounded in the commencement of this examination of Paul, is, Does he teach, by a fair and harmonious interpretation of his language, the immortality of the soul? if not, these expressions which are seized as objections to man's mortality, must have a different exposition from that usually given by current theology.

There are certain expressions, and long trains of arguments put forth by this great Apostle which forever sets this question at rest. See 1 Cor. xv. The entire chapter is a connected argument in proof of future existence, predicated upon the resurrection of Christ, and the consequent resurrection of those that are his. See verse 12. "Now if Christ be preached, that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the *dead*?" Verse 18. "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*." Verse 32. "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me *if the dead rise not*? let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." In this argument the Apostle makes the future existence depend upon the resurrection; which he could not do, if the immortal-soul dogma is true. All the apparently obscure sayings of the Apostle must be explained by those which are plain.

We invite attention to the first item named; viz., *This Tabernacle*. This circumstance is urged as an objection to man's unity and mortality. It is urged

from what the Apostle says in this connection, that man has an immortal soul dwelling in this tabernacle, the body. Please read chapters iv, and v, of 2 Cor., down to the 12th verse of the 5th, and notice several points:

First. Chap. iv, 11. "For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh." Verse 14. "Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you." Verse 16. "For which cause we faint not, but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." Verse 17. "For our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Verse 18. "While we look not at the things which are *seen*, but at the things which are *not seen*, for the things which are seen are *temporal*; but the things which are not seen are *eternal*." Chap. v. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we *groan*, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven. If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan being burdened, not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon that *mortality might be swallowed up of life*. Now, he that hath wrought us for this *self same thing*, is God."

Here then we have an Apostolic conclusion of this whole matter; and what is it? for certainly an inspired Apostolic conclusion is to be preferred to a falli-

ble one. God has wrought us for a certain thing: what is it? That this mortal body should be put off, and the immortal soul fly away to glory? No: this is what popular theology has wrought us for, but not so of God; but, *that mortality might be swallowed up of life*. See verse 10. "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

Now without going into the minutiae in the case, allow me to ask where there is the least support for the immortality of the soul in all this. Does the hope of resurrection with Jesus prove it? Does the hope of an eternal weight of glory? Does the contrast of temporal and eternal things teach it? Does the desire to be clothed upon (not unclothed as the objector has it) that *mortality might be swallowed up of life*? Do any or all these teach it? Certainly not, but quite the contrary.

There is not one jot or tittle of *soul* or *spirit* theology in this entire discourse; but perhaps the objector still insists that *we*, means the soul, and this tabernacle means the shell, or body which contains the *immortal man*, which is talking; if so, it proves too much, if any regard is to be paid to the grammatical construction of the text; for *we* is plural, and this tabernacle, singular; so that our friends in trying to prove from this an immortal soul in a mortal body, get at least two souls in every body, and from aught to the contrary, as far as can be determined by this, two hundred: seeing we may mean more than two, even, but this is not all: every family of souls, be they two or two hundred, have one body on earth and another in heaven; so that they can

according to this notion, have a choice of dwellings, (quite convenient in these days of poverty,) but the marvel is, that after this family of souls, expressed by the *we*, have occupied their heavenly home, house or body for hundreds of years, it should be necessary to re-build the old deserted palace, and call them from their heavenly home to inhabit it again.

And then we are called upon to marvel again, when we find them possessed of such a roving nature. Certainly this is making quite an advocate of transmigration of souls, of the Apostle to the Gentiles. Shall we charge all this folly upon Paul, in order to sustain an objection to man's complete mortality? I trow not. The context shows most conclusively the grand design of this whole argument; viz., that *mortality might be swallowed up of life*, that temporal things might give place to eternal, and not, as it is affirmed by current theology, that mortality might *die* and the immortal soul fledge out and fly.

We next notice Paul's desire to depart. Phil. i, 21. For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not; for I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better. The objector will reason something like this: Paul expected to die and by that means go to be with Christ, in the shape of an immortal soul. Paul expresses a desire to be with Christ, this is clear; but how did he expect to get there, or to be with him? by dying? No; for this was far better than life or death. It may be urged that this is the gain spoken of: to live is Christ, to die is gain; but to whom? to Paul per-

sonally? or to the cause of Christ? See verse 20, and all is clear: life or death would be for the furtherance of the cause of Christ. Whether he should live or die, he did not know; but one thing he was perfectly clear and decided about, and that was his desire to be with Christ. Now how was he to get to be with Christ? by departing? This departing and being with Christ, is the objectionable feature. Is death connected with this? No: it is life. When Paul departs to be with Christ, it will be by leaving this earth, a living man, and departing to mid heavens to meet Christ in the air. See Paul in his letter to the Thessalonians. 1 Thess. iv, 16. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." See 2 Tim. iv, 1-9. "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." Death, instead of translating us to heaven where Christ is, sends us down into the grave, to the land of darkness, as darkness itself. When God wishes to take men to heaven, he does not send them through the dominions of the enemy, but delivers them from death. Enoch and Elijah are standing memorials of God's plan: they were taken away alive, not killed and their immortal ghosts taken; but they were taken bodily, alive; so Paul will go when he departs. God's plan is the same in all ages. Death is declared to be an enemy; and will God

employ an enemy to perform a work which his only begotten Son is especially qualified to perform? We think not. We pass from this to notice the next point in order, which is,

Paul's vision. 2 Cor. xii, 4, 5. "It is not expedient for me doubtless to glory. I will come to visions, and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ about fourteen years ago, (*whether in the body I cannot tell: or whether out of the body I cannot tell: God knoweth;*) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) how that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful (possible) for a man to utter."

The objectionable feature of this vision, if there be any, must be contained in the phrase, "*in the body or out of the body.*" The person urging this as an objection, would reason the case something like this: Paul could be in his body, or out of his body; therefore Paul, the man proper, was the immortal soul, in a mortal body, cage, or shell: he could fly out at pleasure, and return at will.

In the examination of this *vision*, note, first, that Paul did not know what condition he was in, or could not tell, which is the same. Note, second, God only knew. Now will our immortal-soul friends undertake to tell more about this matter, than the Apostle himself knew? Modesty is certainly becoming in this case, to say the least. This cannot be urged as proving any thing touching Paul's condition relative to soul or body, in this investigation. The Apostle himself did not know what condition he was in when he saw these remarkable things. He was

caught up to the third heaven. He was caught up into Paradise. As to how this was accomplished he did not know; and now who will tell us? Our immortal-soul friends are ready to do what Paul could not. Let us hear them: Paul's immortal soul left his mortal body and winged its way to realms of glory where God is, and where Christ now ministers, and while there his disembodied immortality heard unspeakable words which his mortal mouth could not utter, when his soul came back to inhabit its mortal tenement again.

Here then we have this mystery solved. If this is true of Paul's *vision*, I suppose we must have a key for explaining all visions commencing with the first one upon Bible record, and going on to the last. But what condition was Paul's body in during the exit of his soul? was it *dead*? So saith immortal-soulism. Death is the separation of an immortal soul from a mortal body. Then at the return of his soul we have a resurrection. Is it not passing strange that so many deaths and resurrections passed upon prophets and apostles, and yet no record of the matter? So it would appear.

In the body, or out of the body, are expressions indicative of his lack of knowledge as to his real condition during the vision: this is all that can be safely said of these phrases. To undertake to squeeze an immortal soul, or deathless spirit, out of this, is like a drowning man's catching at a straw.

We pass from this to notice another phrase which is not unfrequently brought forth as containing an objection, and so far sustaining the immortal-soul theory. It is Paul's "*inward man.*" 2 Cor. iv, 16. For which cause we faint not; but though our out-

ward man perish, yet the *inward man* is renewed day by day. The objector affirms the inward man to be the immortal soul, and the outward man to be the mortal body. Let us see what is declared of this inward man: it is renewed day by day. Is this declaration properly applicable to immortal souls? If it is, they are not of precisely the kind of composition that our immortal-soul friends represent them to be. To renew day by day, is to make new continually. Is immortality subject to this work of renewing? Is this in any sense proper of immortality? Certainly not, unless immortality be a condition or nature entirely different from that which the term imports.

But we are not left to guess at the meaning of this phrase. By noticing the context carefully, and comparing scripture with scripture, all is plain. See 1 Pet. iii, 4. Peter's *hidden man of the heart*. See Paul's *inner man*. Eph. iii, 16. "That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his *Spirit* in the *inner man*. Note: Strengthened with might by his *Spirit*. Hear Paul's own explanation of this affair: "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." Here then Paul explains himself, and all doubts are removed. See Eph. iv, 23, 24. "And be renewed in the spirit of your mind: and that ye put on the *new man*, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Col. iii, 9. "Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the *old man* with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is *renewed* in knowledge, after the image of him that created him."

Citations of this kind might be multiplied to al-

most any extent; but those already brought are sufficient to place the matter beyond doubt as to what the Apostle meant by the *inward man*. Let us sum up the testimony of this great and faithful witness, upon man's nature. What was Paul's hope? Was it the hope of immortal-soulism? Was it the hope of the flight of his immortal soul to realms of glory at the death of his body? Did he expect death to bring him into the presence of God, Jesus and angels? We enter a positive negation to all these queries. His hope was in the resurrection of the dead; or the change of the living at the coming of Christ in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. See his hope. Acts xxiii, 6; xxiv, 14, 15; xxvi, 6-8; 1 Cor. xv, 12, 18, 29, 32; 1 Thess. iv, 13-18; 2 Tim. iv, 1-9. Any amount of quotations might be adduced which show clearly and beyond a shadow of doubt, Paul's true position touching the matter under investigation. We pass from this to notice certain transaction in the life and teachings of Christ.

MOSES AND ELIAS.

The transfiguration. The objection to man's mortality in this case grows out of the appearance of Moses and Elias, after one had died, and the other was translated. The objector reasons as follows: Moses died and was buried: Moses was seen and heard on the mount of transfiguration, a long time afterwards; therefore Moses had an immortal soul, which did not die. Elias was taken to heaven bodily, and did not die: Elias was seen and heard on the mount of transfiguration a long time afterwards;

therefore Elias had an immortal soul which survived death.

I cannot see any connection, I must confess, between the premise and the conclusion. I cannot see how it would follow logically, that man has an immortal soul, or that Moses and Elias had. It looks strange enough to me to conclude because Moses and Elias were seen and heard on the mount, that therefore they have immortal souls.

Quite a different conclusion would appear to me to be most natural and easy: Moses died and was buried; Moses was seen on the mount; therefore Moses must have been raised from the dead. This conclusion is positively unavoidable, if Moses was in fact present on the occasion. Let us see how the matter stands with Elias. He was taken away alive and bodily; he was present on the occasion of the transfiguration: he must therefore have returned from his place of abode to earth again. To conclude from this circumstance that Moses and Elias had immortal souls, appears to me to be wonderfully far-fetched, to say the least.

But let us look into this matter more closely. The objector reasons the case out after this fashion: Moses died: Moses was seen: now as there is no record of his resurrection, he must have an immortal soul. But there is no intimation that his soul was seen: it was *Moses*; hence the objector is begging the whole question. But are you certain that Moses and Elias were in fact present? I can see no cause for their being present in fact, at all, to answer the design of the promise recorded in Matt. xvi, 28: "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." See Peter's

exposition of this same affair: [2 Pet. i, 16:] "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye witnesses of his majesty."

The object of this vision seems to have been to give Peter, James and John, an eye-sight of the power, majesty and glory of the kingdom. This could be done without Moses and Elias being there in fact. They could appear there in the vision; and so they did. See verse 9: "And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the *vision* to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead. If it is difficult for any one to see how Moses and Elias could be seen, and heard, let them consult the visions of Daniel and John.

Much might be said concerning this matter, but this must suffice for the present occasion. There can be no objection drawn from this, without perverting the whole affair from beginning to end.

CHRIST AND THE SADDUCEES.

Next and last under this head we will examine the conversation between Christ and the Sadducees.

The objector seizes upon two or three isolated expressions in this discourse of the Saviour's, and tries to torture them into the service of immortal-soulism. They are as follows: God is not a God of the dead, but of the living: he is Abraham's, Isaac's and Jacob's God; therefore, they are living, and as their bodies are dead, they must live in the shape of immortal souls.

This is coming to a conclusion very hastily, and without taking into account the object of the argument, at all. Let us notice the conversation from the beginning.

Luke xx, 27. "Then came to him certain of the Sadducees, (which deny that there is any resurrection,) and they asked him, saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us, If any man's brother die, having a wife, and he die without children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. There were therefore, seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and *died* without children. And the second took her to wife, and he *died* childless. And the third took her: and in like manner the seven also: and they left no children, and *died*. Last of all the woman *died* also."

We have now the basis of a very important query, for the Sadducees to present to Christ, who taught the resurrection. Hear it, and remember: "Therefore in the RESURRECTION, (not in the intermediate state of immortal souls,) whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife. And Jesus answering, said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, (not the intermediate state of immortal souls,) neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, (or as it is recorded Matt. xxii, 31: *But as touching the resurrection of the dead*; or in Mark xii, 26: *And as touching the dead, that they rise*,) even Moses showed at the bush,

when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him. Then certain of the scribes answering, said, Master, thou hast well said."

We affectionately request any person who supposes this conversation between Christ and the Sadducees, to contain proof of the existence of life, between death and resurrection, in the shape of immortal souls, to read and compare carefully Matt. xxii, 23-35; Mark xii, 18-28, Luke xx, 27-40, and note 1. The faith of the Sadducees. They professed belief in the writings of Moses, and yet denied the resurrection of the dead: believing and teaching that a person died, and so remained for all time to come. 2. The teachings of Christ. He taught a resurrection of the *dead*.

Here then is a fair issue between Christ and the Sadducees. Now they hear him preaching and teaching the resurrection, and they, to object their faith to his, refer him to what Moses had said concerning marriage, and state a fact, with which they were familiar; viz., the seven brethren, all marrying one woman, and all dying. Now comes a very difficult problem, so thought the Sadducees: How will this matter be managed in the resurrection? (which you teach?) Whose wife will she be in the resurrection? (Not, How will immortal souls manage this affair in the intermediate state?)

Note Christ's answer, as recorded in Mark xii, 24, 25. Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God? (Thousands in the same condition now.) For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are

given in marriage, but are as the angels which are in heaven." Our Saviour, now refers them to Moses for proof of a resurrection, condemning them out of their own mouths, or proving from the very writings which they professed faith in, the very doctrine which he was teaching, and they opposing. See Ex. iii, 6. "Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." How did Moses teach the resurrection, from this circumstance? To my mind it is perfectly plain and easy. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were dead. God is not a God of the dead, (who never live again, or remain dead as you Sadducees believe,) but he is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Now what is the logical and scriptural conclusion? They shall live again, or have a resurrection from the dead.

In this view Christ reasoned well, and answered the grand design of his undertaking; viz., confounded the Sadducees; and this matter was so conducted by our Saviour, as to gain the applause of the Pharisees, who believed in the resurrection.

If I was required to cite a plain case of the resurrection of the dead, I should select the one under investigation. How any person can logically or scripturally deduce immortal souls from this discourse, I cannot for my life see, without perverting the entire transaction, and making Christ a perfect bungler as a reasoner. He sets out to prove a resurrection of the dead; and when he gets through and looks at his conclusion, lo and behold!! it is quite another thing: he has proved that men don't die, and has thereby entirely set aside the resurrection. How he could ever have become noted for his wis-

dom as a reasoner, and teacher, I cannot see, if he was guilty of such bungling as the objector accuses him, in this matter.

I might notice the conclusions usually drawn from this in a syllogistic form, and prove that God was not their God, and that they never would be raised. Let us look at this still further. Note the conclusion to which immortal soulism comes from these statements:

1st. God is not the God of the dead. 2d. God is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Conclusion: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob *are alive*.

If this conclusion is a truthful one, it may become the basis of another syllogism. Let us try it:

1st. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob *are alive*.—2d. Living men are not the subjects of a *resurrection*; therefore, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will *never be raised*. Again,

1st. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob never will be *raised from the dead*. 2d. God is not a God of the dead; therefore he is not their God.

The two last syllogisms are true if the first one is. We see from this to what absurdities and contradictions immortal-soulism drives its advocates. Do, we beseech of you, renounce it, and embrace the plain, simple statements of God's book, and save yourselves from all these absurdities, and at last, after having believed and obeyed the gospel of the kingdom, you shall be called to inherit all its rich promises: immortality, incorruptibility, eternal life, an eternal weight of glory, be seated with Christ in his throne. O, how rich. I am not ashamed of the gospel; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. We will close our notice of objec-

tions of this class, at this point, and continue the investigation from another point; viz., the point of

ETERNAL MISERY.

When immortal-soulism cannot sustain itself without an appeal is made to those scriptures which are supposed to teach an eternity of misery to the wicked, all who urge objections from this point, reason something like this: The wicked are threatened with eternal life in misery, i. e., eternal conscious existence in torments, either mental or physical as the case may be; therefore the wicked in the present life have immortal souls. Immortal soul arguments are remarkably convenient, they can run round in a circle just to suit the occasion.

The soul is immortal; therefore the wicked will be tormented forever and ever. The wicked will be tormented forever and ever; therefore the soul is immortal: first make an assumption and then deduct a conclusion as proved; then assume again, and prove the first assumption, and so on. How very convenient and easy. The first assumption is proved by making another. I can hardly refrain from treating this matter as it seems to deserve; i. e., ridiculously. I hardly know how far a serious Christian may go, and have the approbation of God, in treating upon such frivolous objections. I will however try my very best to treat all objections candidly.

And now to the objections drawn from those scriptures which threaten punishment to the wicked. The positions which we lay down as scriptural in this investigation are these: All men righteous and wicked in the present life are mortal. The righte-

ous only will be made immortal. The immortal-soul advocates undertake to meet these positions something like this:

In popular theology the wicked are represented as living forever in misery. This is affirmed as their final doom for impenitence. In order to this it is urged, they must have immortal souls. I cannot see that this must necessarily follow. All may be mortal in the present life, the righteous and the wicked, and all, both wicked and righteous, may be made immortal at the resurrection.

The one class live forever in bliss, and the other class live forever in misery; and all this pertains to the entire, organized man, or being, and not to an abstract ghost, or disembodied soul. I repeat it, that I cannot see that it must necessarily follow that because the wicked are represented as *living forever in misery*, they must therefore have immortal souls. But our immortal-soul friends seem almost universally to admit by their modes of argumentation, that if they cannot sustain the immortality of the soul, all must go by the board, their Hell of eternal misery and all.

I would not be misunderstood at this point. I say all this might be, but the man who asserts it, must at the same time take upon himself the labor of proving it from the Bible. I will at this point in the investigation, present and examine those texts which are relied upon as proving the soul immortal from the consideration that the wicked are threatened with eternal misery as the penalty for sin. It might be stated something in this form: The wicked will live forever in misery; therefore they have immortal souls. If the premise is proved untrue,

the conclusion must of course be unsound. I cannot see any necessary connection as I have before remarked, between this premise and conclusion; but I will be content to show the premise untrue from the word of God. I will select those scriptures which are most frequently quoted, and most firmly relied upon as proving eternal misery, and thereby, in the estimation of many, proving the immortality of the soul.

The first one presented for examination is the threatening of Jesus, recorded, Matt. xxv, 46. "*And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.*"

It is urged by the objector that eternal misery is as clearly proved from the threatening of "*eternal punishment*," as eternal happiness is by the promise of "*eternal life*." Let me humbly submit to such an one that neither the one nor the other is asserted at all by our Saviour. "Eternal punishment" is placed over against "eternal life." (Not eternal misery over against eternal happiness.) But it may be asserted, that although it is not so said, it so means. The Bible then in this instance stands corrected by such an one. This is taking higher ground than I care about. Humility, such as is becoming a christian, requires that we humbly inquire after the sayings of the great Teacher, and try to ascertain the sense which attaches to them, by a careful comparison of one with another, rather than substituting our own peculiar notions in their place. Why not let the matter stand just as the great Teacher has left it, and believe it just as it stands? The wicked shall have an everlasting (eternal) punishment: the righteous shall have an everlasting (eternal) life.

Now it is urged by the objector that just as certainly as the righteous will have eternal bliss or happiness, the wicked will have eternal misery. Why continue to substitute happiness for life, and misery for punishment? Unless this is done, the whole force of the objection is lost. For punishment is penalty without any reference to its nature: it may be torture, fine, imprisonment, deprivation or death, or any other thing awarded in vengeance of crime.

Now let me respectfully submit to one and all, that when it is proved that the wicked will be punished with an everlasting punishment, nothing whatever is determined with reference to its nature. The question touching the nature of the punishment is still an open one. Our Saviour promised the righteous eternal life. This becomes the basis of all other things promised them in the Scriptures. Unless they have this, all other things promised would be of no account. He threatened the wicked with an everlasting (or eternal) punishment, without naming the nature of the penalty at all.

Now to ascertain its nature, we must consult other scriptures. Where in the Book is future punishment declared to be torture to all eternity? It is not future limited torture, but never-ending torture. Where? I ask again. But it is very dogmatically affirmed by those who assert this as teaching eternal misery, that the penalty threatened the wicked is placed precisely over against the promised reward of the righteous. Now what is precisely the opposite of eternal life? Is it not *eternal death*, or eternal deprivation of life? Most certainly. Is eternal life in misery precisely the opposite of eternal life? Who

will thus contend after looking the matter fairly in the face? No one, I would charitably believe.

If the position almost unanimously and universally taken touching this text by immortal-soulists, be faithfully carried out, it will deprive them of their eternal misery, and consequently of their immortal souls for the wicked. I repeat it, the nature of punishment is not determined by this text. All that can be proved from this, is the eternity of the punishment, not the nature. Other texts by hundreds, come in to aid us in determining this part of the question. Death, destroy, perish, consume, and every other conceivable variety of expression of which the English language is capable, is used in determining the nature; and instead of being an eternal life of misery, mental or physical, it is eternal destruction, or deprivation of life.

The apostle Paul, speaking upon this same theme, uses the very self-same expressions of the Saviour, with an additional one, which determines the punishment, the duration and the nature of it. See 2 Thess. i, 8, 9. "In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with (what? eternal misery? eternal preservation in a miserable life? no!) *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.

Here then we have the punishment the duration, (everlasting) and the nature, (destruction.) This harmonizes with hundreds of plain texts, such as death, consume, be as though they had not been, and so forth. In concluding upon this, one of the

very strongest cases upon record in the Scriptures, allow me to say that eternal misery cannot be proved from this declaration by any fair interpretation. But if some still insist that punishment cannot be eternal, unless the process of punishing is eternally going on, will they please explain how the *Judgment* can be *eternal*, unless the process of judging is eternally going on. Heb. vi, 2. "Of the doctrine of baptisms, and laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of *eternal judgment*."

Allow me to say that punishment is eternal, precisely in the same way the judgment is: that which makes one eternal, does the other; and neither are eternal in the sense of the process being eternally going on. So of *redemption*. See Heb. ix, 12. "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained *eternal redemption* for us." Other instances of this same kind could be adduced, but these are sufficient to lead the honest searcher after truth to examine further for himself.

We leave this theme reluctantly, seeing it is one of the very clearest texts in the Book when properly apprehended. The grand error of those who use this in proof of eternal misery, I believe to be this; viz., understanding *punishment* and *pain* to be synonymous. If this were corrected, all the objectionable features would vanish.

We pass from this to notice another scripture from which an attempt is made to draw an objection; viz., The worm that dieth not, and the fire that is *not quenched*. See Mark ix, 43-48. "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into LIFE maimed, than having two hands to

go into *hell*, (Gehenna,) into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their *worm dieth not*, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell (Gehenna,) into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

The expressions seized upon in this discourse, as containing the proof of eternal misery, and as a consequence, the present immortality of the soul, are, first, the casting into hell; and second, the worm's dying not, and the fire's not being quenched. These taken together are supposed to teach a hell of eternal torture for the final incorrigible.

First, hell is named as the place or locality where this shall be done; and second, the worm and fire denote the torture; and third, the worm's not dying, and the fire's not being quenched, show the duration to be eternal, or never-ending. Put all this together and the proposition is most triumphantly proved in the estimation of an advocate of eternal misery.

But suppose we inquire, in the first place, after the Hell, or locality. The Hell named here is none other than the Gehenna, or Tophet, of the Old Testament, and was not a place where people were cast for the purpose of being eternally tortured, but for the purpose of terminating their existence; for the purpose of destruction, or death. See Jer. vii, 31-33. "And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is

in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart. Therefore, behold the days come saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter; for they shall bury in Tophet till there be no place." See also Jer. xix, 11-15; Isa. xxx, 33. We see from these quotations that the locality is not the locality of the orthodox Hell.

Let us note next in order, the nature of the punishment inflicted. As our objectors are so fond of placing the punishment of the wicked in opposition to the reward of the righteous, suppose we try it in this case. What is to be entered if faithful? LIFE! This is twice named, and in the third instance, the kingdom of God. Now what is the opposite precisely of *life*? Life in misery, or miserable life? No! DEATH! Death, then, stands out in opposition to the life twice promised, and being deprived of the kingdom of God, is the same as being threatened with death; for no one can live forever, who does not enter the kingdom: seeing eternal life is an attribute of the kingdom, and of that only.

Let us look at the case still further. The *worm and fire*—these are the means or instrumentalities by which this torture is carried on. Now how plain! exclaims the objector to the doctrine of death for sin: the *worm does not die*; the worm therefore *must be immortal*; and the fire is not quenched; so you see we have immortal worms and fire, as well as immortal souls.

But what does the immortal worm prey upon, and the unquenchably devouring fire consume, dur-

ing the unknown and untold cycles of eternity? Why, something, to be sure. What? A dead carcass? Oh no: an immortal soul. But where did you get your soul to put into this Hell for worms to feed upon, and the fire to burn? This we have guessed at; for it is the man bodily, and not the immortal, disembodied soul which is the subject of this discourse.

But to let you go on, suppose the body is made immortal, and then cast into this hell for immortal worms, and unquenchable fire to prey upon; what would the result be? let me ask in all candor.

Suppose we present it something in this form: Devouring fire and consuming worms, are brought in contact with an immortal or inconsumable body or soul: what would the consequence be? Very much the same that would follow, were an irresistible force brought in contact with an immovable body. Here is a query for philosophers. But some one is heard saying, This is highly figurative. If so, what would such a figure teach? Suppose a devouring fire, and consuming worm, prey upon men living or dead, what would the result be? If alive, they must soon kill them, and if dead, they must soon consume their carcasses.

This figure, here used, is in fact borrowed from old times. See Isa. lxvi, 24. "And they shall go forth, and look upon the *carcasses* (not immortal souls) of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.

But perhaps some one will still insist that an

unquenchable fire is one that burns to all eternity; and as there can be no use in keeping up a fire when their is nothing to burn, there must therefore, be immortal souls, or bodies, or something else, to burn.

But it is not quite so certain that an unquenchable fire is one that never goes out. To quench a fire is to put it out, before it consumes the object upon which it is preying. A fire is not quenched, or put out, if it continues to burn until it consumes the material or object upon which it is preying.

An unquenchable fire may, and does go out, when it has done its office-work, when it has accomplished the purpose for which it was kindled.

See several instances: Isa. xxxiv, 10, and context. The land of Idumea. Who supposes, for one moment, that the unquenchable fire or burning, is going on now, and will continue to go on to all eternity? See Jer. vii, 20, also Jer. xvii, 27. Here Jerusalem is threatened with the kindling of a fire in her gates, that should *devour* the palaces and should not be quenched. See also Eze. xx, 47, 48. See John the Baptist's testimony concerning Christ. Matt. iii, 12. "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his *wheat* into the garner; but he will *burn up the chaff* with *unquenchable fire*."

Unquenchable fire burns up or devours every thing upon which it kindles. This so far from proving eternal burning, or eternal torture to the impenitent, and, as a consequence, immortality, proves just precisely the reverse. The same can be said in truth of eternal fire. See Jude 7. "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about

them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth *for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.*" But those who insist upon these texts as teaching eternal pain or torture, and especially this one, are very careful to emphasize the word or phrase which has the suffering in it, and the eternal: all other parts are overlooked.

The above named text is quoted as though it read, *Are suffering in eternal fire*; whereas it reads quite differently. Note: Suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Now in the name of reason and revelation what is the *vengeance* of fire? What does fire by its vengeance, accomplish? Ans. The complete destruction of every thing upon which it preys. Are the gates of Jerusalem now burning? Is the land of Idumea, or Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them now suffering in the flames? If the waters of the Dead Sea can extinguish the fires of Sodom and Gomorrah, I should certainly think the burning must have ceased ere this; for its waves now roll over the site where once these cities stood.

The truth is that the worm and fire prove the complete destruction of the whole man or being, instead of its eternal preservation, or immortality. What would a Jew understand by being threatened with Gehenna punishment? They were perfectly familiar with this matter, and would laugh you in the face if you should suggest the idea of being thrown into Gehenna, for the purpose of being eternally preserved. What would the inhabitants of our country understand by being threatened with the punishment of the gallows?

Certainly not the preservation of life, but DEATH. So of the Jews, when threatened with Gehenna punishment: they understood the signification of Gehenna, as perfectly as we do the gallows. Why try to press *life eternal* out of these texts, when it is so plain that they teach precisely the opposite?

We pass from this to notice another text from which a vain attempt is made to prove eternal misery; viz., Rom. ii, 6-10. "Who will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who by a patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and *immortality*; *eternal life*; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the *truth*, but obey unrighteousness: indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every *soul* of man that doeth evil: of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile. But glory, honor, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile; for there is no respect of persons with God."

The objection, if there be any in this, must be found in the threatening of *indignation*, and *wrath*, *tribulation*, and *anguish*. It is freely admitted that the wicked will have a miserable, and painful destruction. Now let me ask the objector, Where lies the proof that this tribulation and anguish will never terminate? It is one thing to prove that tribulation and anguish is connected with the punishment of the wicked, and quite another thing to prove that this will never terminate.

In order for this text to be of any service to immortal-soulists or those believing in eternal misery, it is not only necessary to prove that pain and misery are connected with their doom, (which

I will not deny, but believe as firmly as any one,) but that this pain and misery will continue to all eternity. Do, we pray you, look at the labor which devolves upon you in urging this as an objection. It is freely admitted, that there is tribulation and anguish connected with their doom; but who can prove from the Bible that this will never terminate in their final destruction and death? Hundreds of plain texts come to the aid of the man who will undertake to show that all this tribulation and anguish, however much it may be, or however intense it may be, will terminate in their complete and literal destruction.

But if the favorite mode of argumentation with immortal-soulists be pressed home upon them at this point, it will not aid them much. What is the opposite of glory, honor, immortality and eternal life? for this is so frequently urged, by the objector, that we cannot refrain from reminding him frequently of his own favorite mode of conducting this discourse. Certainly immortality is not the opposite of immortality: eternal life is not the opposite of itself. This may appear strange indeed; but so it is, if popular theology is truthful upon this point.

What, let me ask, is the opposite of immortality and eternal life? Mortality and eternal death. Mortality is life manifested through a corruptible body: immortality is life manifested through an incorruptible body: the one life must terminate; the other never can. Are the wicked any where in the Bible promised immortality? Hear Paul: "For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh *reap corruption*: but he that soweth to the Spirit

shall of the Spirit *reap life everlasting*." Gal. vi. 8. But if the objector is not fully satisfied, let him consult the context. Notice verse 12. For as many as have *sinned* without law, shall also *PERISH* without law. This text then instead of proving eternal torture, or immortality of the soul, proves just precisely the opposite; viz., a miserable destruction, or *perishing*.

We pass from this to notice one more text and must then close upon this branch of this important and interesting theme. Rev xiv, 9-13. "And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints, here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."

This text perhaps as much as any other in the Bible, is relied upon as proving a positive eternity of woe to the sinner, or one who does not worship God. The persons named in this scripture are those who worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand: the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God. They are to be tormented with fire and brimstone. This torment is to be in the presence of the holy angels

and in the presence of the Lamb. It is not said that they are tormented forever and ever, but that the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever. They are to have no rest day nor night who worship the beast and his image, &c.

The only feature of this message which it is important for me to investigate in this place, is the eternity of this torment. The only expression in the whole discourse from which an inference even in favor of eternal misery can be drawn, is, the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever. Now let the issue in this examination be distinctly stated. It is not denied that torment is connected with the future doom of these beast-worshippers.

Our eternal misery friends appear to think the work all done when they produce a text which has torment or pain in it, and would like to have the issue turn upon this point; but this is not the issue; and let me remind them that their work is not even begun, when it is proved that pain and torment is connected with the doom of the wicked of any or all classes; (which is not denied in these remarks, but as firmly believed and as fully advocated as by any.) I repeat it, the work is now fairly before you. I do not deny that pain and torment will be connected with the final doom of these unhappy victims of beast-worship, whenever or wherever they may have their final fate administered; but where is the proof that this is positively eternal? Why, in the expression, "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever." Now will you build an eternity of woe upon this lean, and highly figurative expression.

But let us look more closely at it. The fire may torment, and finally burn up a person, and the smoke go on and on: there is no proof even in this when closely examined. But this torment is to be in the *presence* of the holy angels, and in the *presence* of the Lamb. Now, if this torment is to be positively eternal, how can Paul's declaration in 2 Thess. i, 9, be true? "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction *from* (not *in*) the presence of the Lord, and *from* the glory of his power."

Can any one believe, without good and plain evidence, that the beast-worshippers will live and writhe and weep and be tormented, and all this in the presence of the holy angels and the Lamb, and that to all eternity? A man must have strong credulity to believe such a monstrosity as this upon such testimony as is here adduced, and that too in the face of thousands of plain texts to the contrary. But look again: they are to have no rest *day nor night*; so that this torment is connected with *day and night*. How can those who believe the wicked, of all classes, will be tormented in eternity, harmonize these two notions.

Suppose we go to the very last and closing statements touching the wicked in this book, and see how this torment is terminated. Rev. xx, 9. "And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of heaven, and *devoured* them." Compare this with others. Rev. xi, 15-19, under the sounding of the seventh angel: "And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time

of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great: and shouldest DESTROY them which destroy (corrupt, see margin,) the earth. See another place: Rev. xx, 14. "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the *second death*."

Here is the terminus of their existence. Suffice it to say concerning this text, [Rev. xiv, 9, and onward,] that it comes infinitely short of proving a positive eternity of torture. It proves torment, this is not denied: but it does not prove an eternity of torment. Hundreds of passages show too plain to be mistaken, that the final doom of the impenitent is death, destruction, perishing, ceasing to be, &c. I will give samples under several heads, first,

Death. Deut. xxiv, 16; Eze. xviii, 4, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26; xxxiii, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18; Matt. x, 39; xvi, 25; John iii, 36; vi, 53, 54; xii, 25; 2 Cor. ii, 16; 1 John v, 12. See Rom. ii, 29-32. In this place Paul has enumerated the very worst vices conceivable, and closes up by saying that those which commit such things are worthy of DEATH. If Paul had believed in eternal misery, this would have been an excellent occasion for him to have made it known; but the very worst thing he said is, they are worthy of *death*, not eternal misery. See a number of texts which speak of the wicked's being *burned up*. Mal. iv, 1-3; Isa. xxiv, 6; Matt. iii, 10, 12; xiii, 30.

Consumed. Ps. xxxvii, 20; lix, 13; civ, 25.

Devour. Ps. xxi, 9; Heb. x, 27; Rev. xx, 9.

Perish. Ps. xlix, 12, 20; ii, 12; lxxviii, 2; Luke xiii, 3; Acts viii, 20; xiii, 41; Rom. ii, 12; 1 Cor. i, 8; 2 Cor. ii, 15; 2 Thess. ii, 10; 2 Pet. ii, 12; iii, 9.

Destroy. 2 Thess. i, 9; Matt. x, 28; Acts iii, 23; 1 Thess. v, 2; Ps. cxlv, 20; Prov. x, 29; xxix, 1. Obadiah in speaking of the heathen says, "They shall be as though they had not been."

Let me make a very plain statement in conclusion: All the plain literal statements of holy Scripture are in favor of the doctrine of destruction or death, as the penalty for sin: all the figures when properly examined are found to teach the same doctrine. Eternal misery, and the immortal soul, are not found in that blessed volume, the Bible, and must flow to us from another fountain. The soul that sinneth it shall *die*. The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ. All are now mortal completely: immortality is the gift of God to those who obey the gospel. No wicked or disobedient one will ever be made immortal: they shall perish. I have noticed some of the most important objections, drawn from the intermediate state and the nature of future punishment, and I cannot see any proof whatever, for present immortality to any, or future immortality to the disobedient.

SPIRITUALISM.

Having proved from the Bible, man's complete mortality, we are prepared to go on and show from the same book, the nature and destiny of modern Spiritualism, and offer, the only antidote for the same.

In making a practical application of the Bible doctrine of man's mortality, it will be necessary in the first place to notice and define *Modern Spiritualism*; in the second place to show its *seductive influence*, and in the third place to *apply the only antidote*. We will pursue this order in the investigation. And first, what do we understand by spiritualism? In the sense in which we use the word, it means, The doctrine that man has connected with his present organism, an immortal nature or part, called by the different names of immortal soul, deathless spirit, or inner spiritual life, &c., to the end of the vocabulary of names meaning the same thing. It is the notion in short, that man has immortality some how, or in some shape, connected with his present organism.

I am not particular at all as to the peculiar shape or form this notion takes in different ages: it is the same in the mouth of the *Serpent*, *Heathen Philosophers*, *Catholic Priests*, *Modern Popular Theologians*, or last in the list, *Modern Spiritualists*. I repeat it, it is the same in substance: it is *natural immortality*. This notion we would oppose with plain Bible, which declares im-

mortality to be through Jesus, to be *put on* at the *resurrection*. Modern Spiritualism, we understand to be the last phase which this notion presents to the world, under the head of Spiritualism, Spirit Manifestations, Mysterious noises, &c., and more recently, in the more refined and perfect communications through mediums in writing, speaking, &c.

This, then, we understand to be modern Spiritualism. There is no danger of being mistaken or misunderstood in our definition of Spiritualism, and especially of modern Spiritualism. The phenomenon is too notorious in the United States to be mistaken. It is claimed by those believing in this peculiar type of Spiritualism, that the spirit being eliminated or thrown off from the body at death, and passes into the spheres, first, second, third, and so on, according to its respective degree of development and perfection, while in the body, and that it returns and communicates with the living on earth, giving them good advice, teaching them how to live, and what their fate will be hereafter, &c.

These spirits after departure from the body, are great Theologians: they know all about God and the Bible. Some of the most bitter enemies to the Bible, when in the body, speak very beautifully touching this Book when out of the body; and *vice versa*. This modern Spiritualism is doing more towards turning men away from the Bible, and its plain truths, and making converts to its peculiarities, than all other forms of infidelity put together. This is the master-piece: notice its beginning, progress and present prospects.

Says Hon. J. W. Edmonds, Judge of the Supreme Court:—"Scarcely more than four years have elapsed since the Rochester knockings were first known among us. Then mediums could be counted by units, but now by thousands; then believers could be numbered by hundreds, now by tens of thousands.

It is believed by the best informed that the whole number in the United States must be several hundred thousand, and that in this city (New York) and its vicinity there must be from twenty to twenty-five thousand. There are ten or twelve newspapers and periodicals devoted to the cause, and the *Spiritual Library* embraces more than one hundred different publications, some of which have already attained a circulation of more than ten thousand copies. Besides the undistinguished multitude there are many men of high standing and talent ranked among them—doctors, lawyers and clergymen in great numbers, a Protestant bishop, the learned and reverend president of a college, foreign ambassadors and ex-members of the United States' Senate."

This history of Spiritualism given by Hon J. W. Edmonds, could be greatly enlarged at the present date, as the votaries are increasing rapidly in numbers and rank. Here then we have modern Spiritualism commencing in the latter part of March, 1848, in an obscure family, under the head of rappings, and growing to a perfect giant in the short period of less than seven years, with the prospect of continued and more perfect development in the future. This is Modern Spiritualism; and this

wholesale deception and infidelity is based upon the *immortality of the soul*.

See the testimony of some of the most refined spirits from the spirit land. From John C. Calhoun. "My friend, the question is often put to you, What good can result from these manifestations? I will answer it: *It is to draw mankind together in harmony*, and convince skeptics of the IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL."

See another from W. E. Channing:

"Q.—What do the spirits propose to accomplish by their new manifestations?

"A.—To unite mankind, and convince skeptical minds of the *immortality of the soul*."

These two refined spirits agree most charmingly in their testimony touching this fundamental doctrine. This lies at the very bottom of Spiritualism of every age and form, and if it is removed from beneath it, it must fall. We do not expect to take this false foundation from the mass, but will be content to remove it from a few good and honest souls who prefer the word of God to the teachings of Satan and the traditions of men.

We offer the Bible as teaching the truth touching man's nature and destiny, and in that blessed volume, we cannot find immortal soul applied to man in the present state. It is not in fact found in the Bible. We cannot find immortality promised to any one who does not believe the gospel, or partake of the benefits of the atonement, or plan of salvation through Christ. All are now mortal wholly: a part will be made immortal wholly;

and that part will be those who partake of the benefits of redemption.

The wicked who sow in this present life to the flesh, will reap corruption, not immortality. Whence then originates this notion of natural immortality, upon which Spiritualism, ancient and modern, is based? for certainly such a mighty stream must have a fountain somewhere.

1st. It did not originate with God: if it did, some of his prophets would have expressed this sentiment. Jesus, who was sent from God, would have breathed it out in some of his numerous teachings, or certainly some of his apostles would have uttered something from which it could at least be fairly inferred. The Bible, the Book of God, would contain this system of doctrine if from him. We repeat it, this Spiritualism is not from God, does not flow down to us through the channel of prophets, Jesus and the apostles; but the Bible does furnish information touching its founder and first teacher, and its nature and destiny; and we invite the especial attention of all interested, to those scriptures which give us a clue to its origin, character and destiny.

We invite attention then to its originator. Immortal-soulism has been placed to the credit of heathen philosophers as the originators; I beg leave to antedate heathen philosophy a trifle, unless the Serpent, or the Devil, was the first heathen philosopher: in this case I would not differ with such.

Genesis. God created Adam and Eve, and placed them in a beautiful garden of delights. He placed before them *life* and *death*: *life* for obe-

dience, *death* for disobedience. He forbade their eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil lest they should *die*. Gen. ii, 15-18.

See Gen. iii, 1-6. "Now the Serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made; and *he* said unto the woman, Yea, hath *God said*, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden; and the woman said unto the *Serpent*, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden, but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, *God* hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye *die*. And the *Serpent* said unto the woman, YE SHALL NOT SURELY DIE; for God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened: and ye shall be as *God's*, knowing good and evil."

Here then we have God on one side and the Devil on the other: the devil contradicting God. Now who shall we believe? The one who gives immortality through Jesus Christ and a resurrection, or the one who gives it, or promises it I should say, through death. Which shall we believe, God or the Devil? when there is a plain contradiction. God never lied: the Devil is a liar from the beginning.

Here is the fountain: *Ye shall not surely die*, but be as *Gods*. Oh how easily the poor proud heart of man has been deceived by this flattering promise: *be as Gods*. We don't *DIE*: we may appear to, but nothing dies: we, that is the man proper, the spirit, ascends to the Gods, to be a little god among the Gods. So taught the Devil;

and Heathen philosophers, have but imitated the language of Satan, in their teachings upon this theme. The Devil then is the originator; and Spiritualism, ancient and modern, is the Devil's doctrine. There can be no question as to its pater-
nity, its origin; and the teaching of Heathens, Catholics, Protestants, and last, not least, modern Spiritualism refined, is but an imitation of the old stereotyped sermon preached by Satan in the garden of Eden.

From this point we can trace both streams down to the present: the doctrine of God, Ye shall surely *die*, and the doctrine of the Devil, Ye shall *not* surely *die*. The one channel can be traced through apostolic teachings, the teachings of Christ and prophets, up to God; the other through modern Spiritualists, Protestants, Catholics, and Heathen philosophers, up to the Devil.

From this point we invite attention to other Scriptures, pointing out this doctrine of the Devil known in these days under the more polished and refined name of *Spiritualism*. Isa. viii, 19. "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have *familiar spirits*, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter, should not a people seek unto their God? for the *living* to the *dead*? To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because *there is no light in them*." The context and every thing in this quotation fits Spiritualism most perfectly. The association, verse 9, taking council together, verse 10, confederacy, verse 12, stumbling and

falling, verse 15, binding up the testimony, sealing the law, verse 16.

All this refers to the present time and applies. Then notice the saying, When *they* shall say, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits. This is just what modern Spiritualism is saying through its lectures, periodicals, and all its communications. Seek information from the dead, or the spirits of those who are *dead*, (who according to Scripture *know not any thing*.)

But what saith the Prophet of God? Verse 20. "To the law and to the testimony." What! go from the living God, from the word of God, to the dead? No: to the law and to the testimony. Who of us will obey this direction and turn away from these familiar spirits to the living God, and his word? Who, I inquire again, will obey this injunction?

As we have not time to notice all the prophetic declarations touching this modern wonder, we will notice several New Testament Scriptures upon this point:

1st. The sayings of the apostle Paul. 1 Tim. iv, 1-4. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the *latter times*, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to *seducing spirits and doctrines of Devils*."

Notice the preparation: departing from the faith, or word of God; that is, turning away from the belief or faith in God's word. Is this true in preparing the way for modern Spiritualism? Are those who believe in modern Spiritualism, infidel

with reference to God's book? Let us hear them testify: we will judge them out of their own mouths.

The *Bible Examiner* of July, speaking of the "Bible Convention," so named, called by Andrew Jackson Davis, says: "A long string of charges was brought against the Bible, by the Chairman, Joseph Barker, of Ohio, recently from England, and formerly a Methodist preacher, in which he attempted to make out that the Bible sanctioned all manner of crimes, &c. He was followed by Henry C. Wright, formerly a Congregational minister: once a Non-Resistant and Peace man, but now an opposer of the Bible. He opens with the following resolution:

"Resolved. That the Bible, in some parts of the Old and New Testaments, sanctions injustice, concubinage, prostitution, oppression, war, plunder, and wholesale murder; and therefore, the doctrine of the Bible, *as a whole*, is false, and injurious to the social and spiritual growth and perfection of man." Is not here a departure from the faith of God's book?

Note the second point: giving heed to *seducing spirits*. Are not these spirits seducers? Let us notice briefly.

1st. A seducer, is one who appears under the garb of friendship; one who pretends to be your warmest friend. Is not this the case with these spirits? Rap, rap, rap! Who are you? Your dear husband, your best friend. Rap, rap, rap! Who are you? Your wife, your warmest friend, come to converse with you. Rap, rap, rap! Who are you? Your son, daughter, father, mother, or in short, your warm-

est and tenderest friend: one who loves you dearly. And then this so-called spirit will relate some of the most endearing circumstances and connections in life, make some of the most powerful appeals to sympathy, gain your confidence, and then you are prepared for deception.

Are not these spirits just such kind of creatures? They are, always boasting of virtue and goodness, to begin with, but when they secure your confidence, and get you completely blinded to their arts, they will poison you to death. I might cite instances which have come under my own observation.

Notice how most of them speak of the Bible, when they first commence their seductions upon those who have some confidence in that blessed volume:

The Bible is not *precisely* the book you look upon it to be, it has a great many good things in it, some few errors. I believe the Bible, oh yes, I believe the Bible, and even take a text from it when I lecture. Very nice, until you become duped, and then hear the changed tone, quite another story: "a very bad book, false, horrible, the old skin of the serpent, not fit to be read," and so on. This is the way these spirits manage matters, filling up the character of a seducer in every particular.

2d. Do they not teach doctrines of Devils? They do. They are preaching the Devil's doctrine, "*Thou shalt not surely die*," continually. This is the very basis of their whole system of Spiritualism; so that Paul has pointed this modern won-

der out, in three points most clearly. 1st. Departing from the faith of God's word. 2d. Giving heed to seducing spirits. 3d. Doctrines of Devils.

Let us pass from this to notice another statement of the Apostle. Note verses 2 and 3. They are equally true. We have not time to go into detail. See 2 Tim. iii, 1-10, especially verses 6, 8: "For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive *silly women*, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts. Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith."

Notice two points in this quotation. 1st. The persons led captive. Now it is a notorious fact that two thirds of those who are seduced into this delusion of Satan, are silly women, weak minded women who can easily resign their wills to another. The first mediums, and the great majority of those who have since become such, are *silly women*. 2d. They withstand and resist the truth, as Jannes and Jambres did Moses. See Ex. vii, 10, 11, 12. These sorcerers and magicians of Egypt, undertook to do the same miracles that Moses and Aaron wrought. Let us see if this is not strictly true of these modern Spiritualizers. They say that they can do the same miracles that Jesus and the apostles did. Notice some instances: "The spirit of Christ was not wholly separated from the body, when he was placed in the tomb, and the guardian spirits who attended him through life, using him as a medium, rolled away the stone, restored the spirit to the body, and Christ walked

bodily out of the tomb; sometime afterward he died naturally, his body was left to moulder back to dust, and his spirit, seen only by those who were mediums, ascended to heaven." From Dr. Bristol's letter, *Telegraph*, No. 34.

"The spirit of Channing says: The spirit of Lazarus had not entirely left the body: he was in a trance. Christ in his superior condition saw this, and by his magnetic power restored the action of the system. The same was done at the restoration of the maid." *Telegraph*, No. 34.

The miracles of the Bible are either denied *in toto*, or explained so that Spiritualizers can perform them. Where one is superior to their explanations, or arts, it is denied. Others are explained down to magnetism; and then they come in and declare themselves able to perform them. Just as Jannes and Jambres did, they undertake to imitate the miracles of God.

"But they shall proceed no further." When they fill up their cup, when they carry this deception to its height, they shall *perish*. Notice carefully verse 9. Notice other predictions which point out this modern phenomenon. See Paul 2 Thess. ii, 9. "Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them *strong delusion* that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

All this applies, as to time; just before the coming of Christ the second time to destroy the man of sin: as to character; the working of Satan with power, in its physical manifestations and in its influence over the minds of men: signs; it presents a sign of the near coming of Christ; and it certainly is a wonder. Wonder! wonder! has been the cry from the beginning. As to its being a *lying* wonder, no one can doubt who believes God's book. As to its being a *strong delusion* note the thousands and tens of thousands who are being deluded continually by it; so that in every particular it is a perfect fit.

See John's testimony, Rev. xiii, 14: "And *deceiveth them* that dwell on the earth by the means of those *miracles* which he had power to do in the sight of the beast." See also Chap. xviii, 1-3. "And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lighted with his glory, and he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, *Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen*, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and cage of every *unclean and hateful bird*." See Chap. xiv, 13, 14. "And I saw *three unclean spirits*, like frogs come out of the mouth of the Dragon, and out of the mouth of the Beast, and out of the mouth of the False Prophet. (Two-horned Beast, compare the two.) For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that *great day* of God Almighty. Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he

that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked and they see his shame."

Note several points, 1st. *Spirits of devils*. 2d. *They work miracles*. 3d. They deceive, and are instrumental in gathering the several parties to the battle of God Almighty. 4th. This is when these spiritual influences go out of the mouth, (or legislative department,) of these three powers, viz., Dragon, Beast, and False Prophet, or Two-horned Beast. These spirits are now working powerfully in the bodies of these governments, and working their way to the mouth. When they go out of the mouth, then will come the final conflict. They are working with power now: then, according to Paul, they will work with all power.

In concluding upon this branch of the subject, we invite attention to the sayings of our Saviour, as recorded, Matt. xxiv, 23, 24. "Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo here is Christ, or there, *believe it not*. For there shall arise false christs, and false prophets, and shall show great *signs and wonders*; inasmuch that *if it were possible they shall deceive the very elect*."

Notice several statements made by our Saviour. 1st. Then if any man shall say, &c. When? Turn back to verses 21, 22, and notice the tribulation and shortening of the days for the purpose of saving some of the *elect*. This tribulation and persecution was upon the people of God, the *elect*: it was shortened through the influence of the Reformation. *Then* fixes the time; that is, after this tribulation and shortening of the days. *Then* if any man shall say, Lo here, or, Lo there. We

have had, and are now having, in these modern wonders, a perfect fulfillment of this language of Jesus. Within a few years, many have come in the name of Christ, saying, I am Christ. The Mormons have said, and are now saying, Go into the desert, Christ will come there. Ann Lee said that Christ had come in her person. I conversed some two or three hours with a man not many days since, in Pennsylvania, who said Christ had come in him: he was Christ, in the sense that hundreds are proclaiming; that is, Christ's second coming and all the coming now promised as future, is to be in the appearance of such men.

But modern Spiritualism fills this up to perfection: "What is the meaning of the word Christ? 'Tis not as is generally supposed, the Son of the Creator of all things. Any just and perfect being is Christ. The crucifixion of Christ is nothing more than the crucifixion of the spirit, which all have to contend with, before becoming perfect and righteous. The miraculous conception of Christ is merely a fabulous tale." *Telegraph*, No. 37.

"Jesus never taught people to pay divine homage to him: he never taught that he was the Son of God, except in the sense in which other men might be the Sons of God." *Unfoldings*, p. 7.

Here then we have many coming in my name and saying, I am Christ, and deceiving many. "For there shall arise *false christs*, and *false prophets*, and shall shew *great signs and wonders*."

This is strictly true of modern Spiritualism. Signs and wonders are the grand moving power of the whole machinery. They come, saying, as quoted above, I am

Christ: Christ is any good man; I am a good man; I am Christ. Then they prove their mission by their signs and wonders.

Notice, 2d. This is to deceive many, yea all, except the elect; that is, those who believe in the Bible. This last deception of Satan is to be carried to such an extent, and is to be presented in so many forms, that no one can resist it, unless they have a well grounded hope in the truth of God's book. All who turn away from the truth of God's word, will most certainly be deceived and perish. The delusion will be so strong that none can resist it, who do not have on the whole armor of God, and stand watching unto prayer. This is our only safety, our only refuge. Flee, then, to God's word. Believe it, obey it, patiently continue in well-doing, and seek for glory, honor, immortality, and God will give you eternal life.

In conclusion, I would invite attention to the fact, that modern Spiritualism, although differing slightly from some other forms of Spiritualism, is nevertheless based exclusively and solely upon the dogma of *natural immortality*. If this dogma is untrue, as I have attempted from God's book to show, then this mighty structure of modern wonders, must prove a falsehood, a strong delusion of Satan, a lie!

The Devil's doctrine, which is now deceiving and deluding its thousands and tens of thousands, is destined to go on in its mad career of falsehood and deception, until all, except the elect, those who believe God's truth and obey it, shall be deceived and fitted for destruction.

Thousands are in a sad condition, perfectly blinded to Satan's arts and wiles; and should these lines meet the eye of any such, let me say to them, Be entreated in the name of God and truth, to flee from this fatal delusion, and lay hold on the hope of the gospel, which is the hope of *eternal life*, an eternal weight of glory in the kingdom of God.

Do, we entreat you, as you love life, glory, honor and immortality, be persuaded to seek for it in God's own way: the only way given on earth or among men whereby we must be saved. Turn away from Satan's first lie, *Thou shalt not surely die*, but be as gods, and believe that death entered by sin, (not life,) and that your only hope of immortality is through Jesus and the resurrection, or a change equivalent thereto.

PUBLICATIONS.

THE ADVENT REVIEW AND SABBATH HERALD;
Published Weekly, at One Dollar a year, in Advance.

THE YOUTH'S INSTRUCTOR; Published Monthly,
at 25 cts. a year.

The Four Universal Monarchies of the Prophecy of
Daniel, and the Kingdom of God.—8 cts.

Sabbath Tracts, Volume I, Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 4—152
pp.—12½ cts.—postage 1 ct.

The Atonement—196 pp.—15 cts.

The Law of God—Testimony of Both Testaments—
132 pp.—10 cts.—postage 1 ct.

The Sanctuary and 2300 days by J. N. A.—10 cts.

Perpetuity of the Royal Law " " —5 cts.

Review of O R L Crozier—Sabbath " " —

Signs of the Times.—Spirit Manifestations—10 cts.

Time and Prophecy (Poem) 25 cts.—paper cov 15 cts.

A Word for the Sabbath (Poem)—5 cts.

The 2300 days and the Sanctuary—5 cts.

The History of the Sabbath—5 cts.

Why Don't you keep the Sabbath-day? Extracts
from Catholic Works—5 cts.

Solemn Appeal—Coming of Christ—3 cts.

True Picture—state of the Churches—16 pp.

The Sabbath by Elihu—16 pp.

Both Sides—on the Sabbath—16 pp.

The Sabbath by P. Miller Jr.—16 pp.

First day of the week not the Sabbath—16 pp.

Review of Objections to the Sabbath—16 pp.

Tracts of 16 pp. sent by Mail, and postage paid, at
\$1 per 100, in packages of not less than 50.

Sabbath and Advent Miscellany—seven of the above
Tracts bound in paper covers—10 cts.

Address: James White, Rochester, N. Y. 109 Monroe
Street.